

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLI

JUNE, 1943

NO. 966

Challenge of the Postwar World

THE HON. HARRY F. KELLY

BECAUSE we cannot completely disassociate the social problems of our civilization from the political and economic, the approach to any postwar planning must be broad enough to encompass that field. There are certain fundamentals which must, of necessity, be considered.

The transition from peace to war is gradual; the transition from war to peace is abrupt. However sudden and unexpected the attack on our naval installations at Pearl Harbor which plunged us into an actual state of war, the process of transition from a peacetime economy to a wartime economy was in an advanced stage of development. The Lend-Lease plan and national conscription may be cited as instances of this. But the wartime economy we are under must suddenly become a peace-time economy. It may come like a blinding flash of lightning in a storm-filled sky; there is a reverberating roll of thunder, the winds

*Address of the Governor of Michigan
at the Regional Congress of the
National Federation of Catholic College
Students, Marygrove College, Detroit,
March 6, 1943.*

suddenly quiet, and a gentle rain sifts down upon the parched earth. Within an hour, there is peace, where before all was tumult and destruction.

The Armistice in 1918 caught the world wholly unprepared, and the world is paying dearly today for the period of confusion which followed. However well-meant, disarmament was a futile gesture, a hollow mockery. There is no doubt that the League of Nations was a step in the right direction, but time and events proved it powerless. Because it functioned through diplomatic channels, it became the center of plot and counter-plot between nations.

If we have learned any lesson from these bitter experiences, it is that the

impelling force to check the unholy ambitions of a militaristic few must come from within and certainly not from without.

We won a victory of arms in 1918, and lost the peace in the years which followed. When our first attempts at world peace failed, we gave up the struggle and turned back to internal problems. We began to educate ourselves not for peace, but against war. When the first faint rumblings of the gathering storm began to be heard a decade ago, we retreated further into the false security of our shell and regaled ourselves with tales of horror about war.

Many of you may recall how the photographic files of World War I were combed for pictures portraying war in all its bloody inhumanity. The pomp and ceremony of war were stripped away. Gone were the waving flags, the colorful parades, the stirring music. Instead, you were shown the stinking corpses, the torn and bleeding flesh, the helpless cripples. The sponsors of such "education" believed that by shocking the sensibilities of the American people, it would be possible to build up a revulsion against war that would be tantamount to a secure and lasting peace.

You cannot work at the problems of peace for a few years following a war and come to a completion of your task. The job has no end. If the World War III of 1960, and the World War IV of 1980 are to be prevented, peace must be a continuing problem. It can-

not be spasmodic. It cannot be circumscribed in peace treaties. There must be an end to despair, and a clinging to hope—not for hope of a perfect world, but hope for a steady improvement. We would do well to heed the words of Lincoln: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

MUST WORK FOR PEACE

This war will leave seeds of hate scattered far and wide. They will sprout readily in the fertile soil of the desolated nations. They will spring up in unexpected places. The farmer hoes the weeds from his growing fields. He turns them under with plow and harrow and cultivator. He gathers them up with the rake and destroys them by fire. He is unrelenting, knowing from experience that the moment he lets up he is powerless to cope any longer with the problem. When that point is reached, he abandons his field to the weeds. The peace of the world for years to come will strive for existence amid the smoldering hates engendered by this war. Long after the Nazis are gone and almost forgotten, the work of nurturing peace and eradicating the seeds of hate must continue without interruption.

Our national government will be pre-occupied with international prob-

lems in the months that will follow the conclusion of the active fighting. The conquered peoples of Europe and Asia must be fed and clothed and housed. Famine already scourges their lands. Their tragic miseries must be relieved. Our nation will be called upon to provide much of the leadership and most of the food in what will be perhaps the most colossal relief undertaking in all human history.

We must assist with statesmanship and money in one of the largest mass migrations of all time when the millions of refugees who have been driven from their homes by prescriptive laws or by advancing armies must be resettled. This too will be a national problem. Nor will our government be able to retreat before any of these problems. They do not affect only Europe and Asia. They affect you and me. There can be no durable prosperity in this country until a gravely stricken world has been rehabilitated. Reconstruction will be a long and difficult process.

Our internal problems growing out of the war will be state problems, calling for united action on the part of our people to meet them and to cope with them. The surplus funds that now exist in state treasuries must be set aside, in generous part, to meet the burdens arising from changed conditions. This too must be a continuing action as long as revenues exceed expenditures. Some provision will have to be made for financial aid in the rehabilitation of our returning soldiers.

I am sure that the governments of our several states will not fail to see the need, and prepare to meet it. But these are essentially problems of economy, and I have no desire to burden you with a discussion of them in this conference.

Long after the pall of acrid smoke has cleared from the shell-torn fields of battle, and the last truckload of rubble has been cleared from the streets of gutted cities, rehabilitation will be taking place all over America, all over the world. The adjustment of our returning service men to post-war conditions will not be accomplished in a brief span. It will be a long and gradual process.

Those boys who have gone out there to fight will come back men. They will be changed—physically and mentally. From our colleges and universities they have gone forth in ever-increasing numbers, joining their fellow Americans from shops and offices and fields and factories. Most of them are young in years and young in experience. Still in their teens or scarcely out of them, they have put aside their books, their tools, their pursuits of peace and taken up the deadly weapons of war. Ten million and more of them are going out there—to kill or be killed.

A few years ago these boys were playing high school football or delivering newspapers or working part-time in the corner store. They were studying to be doctors or lawyers or pharmacists. They were working with

their fathers in the fields or dreaming of the day when they would be transport pilots or radio engineers. In the comfort and the security of their own homes, war was a long way off. What was happening in China or Spain or Ethiopia could not compete in their minds with the happenings at Briggs Stadium or Shibe Park or Ebbetts Field. Those other things were far away, across thousands of miles of ocean. These things were real, right here at home.

WAR WILL LEAVE MARK

And they have gone, these lads of ours, gone out to the steaming tropical jungles and the burning deserts; gone out to strange far-away places they remembered vaguely from their geography books; gone out to those very places that seemed so far away before. They have gone out to kill—to maim—to strike down the enemy wherever he may be. For that is war. These boys who never before saw death—who only played at war with wooden guns and toy soldiers—who only thought of life as something fine and clean—and death as something for the very old and spent; these boys who never before had traveled far—who perhaps had never gone beyond their state; these boys who never before had suffered the pangs of homesickness, or cried out to a mother who wasn't there . . . there they are, packs on their backs, guns in their hands, thousands of miles from all they loved and cherished. Boys they

were when we waved good-bye to them with a prayer on our lips and hope in our hearts. Men they'll return, those who survive.

War casualties are not confined to those whose bodies have been torn by shell, or to those whose minds have been blurred through shock. You cannot put a human being through the nightmare of horror that modern war has become and expect no marks to show. You cannot torture men's souls and wrack men's bodies and torment men's minds in this chamber of horrors, day after day, night after night, in burning heat and freezing cold and expect their systems to withstand all shock.

War is purifying, there are some who will tell you. It is a cleansing agent that is not without benefit to the racial strain. It is a builder of bodies and a strengthener of minds. It takes weaklings and makes men of them. I won't argue the point other than to say that you cannot expect each succeeding generation to go through this hellish business and not succumb in time through sheer exhaustion.

War leaves its mark on the civilian population too, remote from the theatres of war. A peaceful people are caught up in the whirl, their emotions spun to dizzy heights. Patriotic fervor gives them a strength and unity they never knew before. The day of peace brings sudden exhaustion. Pent-up emotions are released. Body and mind seek rest. There is national weariness,

where but a brief while before was willing strength.

This too must be guarded against. After the first World War, and that one brief moment of elation, there was a sense of relief that lulled our people into a false security. A war is not won with the last battle. It is not over with the terms of armistice or surrender. For war and peace have no beginning and end. They are a continuous action. War is the breakdown of peace, the failure of peace. A nation that doesn't pursue peace with the same zeal it is forced to pursue war will find soon enough it has a war to pursue.

Our national lethargy in the years immediately following the last war was responsible for the failure of the peace. We looked upon war as a disrupting interlude in our peaceful existence. Once over, we immediately forgot its presence. That must not happen again. The postwar rehabilitation of our returning young men as well as the postwar adjustment of our people at home devolve squarely upon our shoulders. It is your problem and mine. It is a problem for the State and the political subdivisions of the State.

PLAN NOW FOR FUTURE

The time for deliberate planning for the future is now. While victory in the war must be our immediate goal, with every other action subordinated to it, victory in the peace is our secondary objective. Intensive preparations must be made for peace, just as intensive preparations are made

for war. The problems of peace, following previous wars, were left to chance with the result that peace was nothing more or less than a respite from war, a breathing spell to give the contestants an opportunity to replenish their armaments and make new alliances. The enormous problems of demobilization, relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction require something more tangible than theorizing.

The only difficulty that lies in the way of effective postwar planning is the very uncertainty of the future. There is no knowing how long the war will last, nor how it will end. And yet, even this is not a discouraging prospect. In the preparation for war, you do not know when hostilities will begin, nor under what circumstances. There isn't too much certainty either who your enemy will be. But of this we are certain: when the war is over, much of the world will be a shambles, but it will at least be our world, not Hitler's. It will be our task to rebuild. It will be our task to liberate the world from the fear of terrorism and political murder, from the fear of unemployment and insecurity, from the fear of war and the threat of war.

I know you must have your own ideas of the better world you want to build for yourselves. I know too you must be somewhat impatient with the world your elders have shaped for you. It is easy to criticize the record of your leaders in the generation now passing. It is simple enough to hold them up

to ridicule and contempt for the mistakes they made. We fought a war to end war, and muddled the peace which followed. We openly flouted the laws of our own making in the roaring 20's. We skyrocketed to dizzy heights in an artificial prosperity and saw millions of our people suffer hunger, disease and despair in the richest country on earth.

SOME PROGRESS MADE

You have grown up in what may well be recorded in some future day as the most grotesque period in history. Within your own time you have seen most of our sins and follies, and looked upon some of the dark pages in our records. And yet I would come to the defense of your elders. With all our faults, there have been bright spots, too. In the field of public health, the record is promising. Deaths from measles, scarlet fever, whooping cough and diphtheria have dropped 31% in a single year. Deaths from tuberculosis are down nearly 50% in 10 years; deaths from pneumonia have been cut in half in three years. In America, the average lifetime is 16 years longer now than it was in 1910. Our soldiers today are 2 inches taller and 15 pounds heavier than were their fathers in 1917. If we have made grievous errors in the past twenty-five years, they have been in the field of government rather than in science or industry.

If you can place your finger on any underlying cause for our national and international sins of omission and

commission, it must rest squarely in the field of moral and religious education. Long before World War I, liberalism, science, progress and relativism combined their forces in Germany, France, Belgium, Holland and throughout the English-speaking world, to deal a mortal blow to Christian education. The modernists had come to the conclusion that education could now proceed without God. The sense of right and wrong was abandoned.

The war we are waging today is more religious in nature than any war in modern history. Since 1933, the Nazi persecutions and the Nazi abandonment of God have served to focus the attention of the world on moral standards. The mass depravity of the Nazi mind brought home to us the realization of how far the world had shifted from its moral and religious foundation. We have finally come to see that it is impossible to preserve human and democratic values on a base that is neither moral nor religious.

Once the education of the world abandoned moral standards, its governing bodies became incapable of passing judgment on the rightness and the wrongness of political and economic actions. The world was setting a greater store on the material refinements of education, and neglecting the development of the moral sense. The only difference between the educated and the uneducated was material information, rather than the wisdom which prepares our youth for moral leadership.

Abandon ethical standards in education, and you abandon a proper sense of values. Substitute the criterion of power for the purpose of life and you increase the prospects for revolution and war. Deny the difference between right and wrong, and you remove the faculty of judging between truth and propaganda. In our time, we have seen utter moral depravity existing side by side with a high degree of scientific advancement. By force of arms we hope to restore the moral distinction between right and wrong.

I have no wish to trespass upon the themes of my colleagues in this conference, but social rehabilitation is so closely allied with the cultural and the moral I might be forgiven this slight over-lapping. Our whole structure of government is predicated upon a belief in God. And while Christian education in many parts of the world was apparently dead, its presence in America was sufficiently alive to keep faith in the Declaration of Independence by preserving in our national life a belief in God, affirming the wisdom of our nation's founders who declared that all our rights are derived from God.

MUST STEM FROM GOD

Christian education has kept faith with our national leaders who, from the time of our nation's birth, have warned our people that government must stem from God. It was George Washington who said that "reason and experience both forbid us to expect that

national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." The writings of Lincoln are replete with similar expressions. On one occasion he spoke these words: "It is the duty of nations as well as of men to owe their dependence upon the overruling power of God, and to recognize the sublime truth announced in Holy Scripture and proven by all history, that these nations alone are blessed." Our own president has said: "Only a spiritual regeneration can save the world."

Many of our universities have abandoned both religion and morality. In so doing, I think, they have been, willingly or unwillingly, a party to weakening the structure of democracy. Just a fortnight ago, Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen warned of the peril of suppressing religious education. "Given another generation of godless education," he declared, "and we will have tyranny; given religion and morality in education and we will be the most potent government influence for peace in the world. Then shall America be great. And we shall love it because it is great; it will be great because we will love it in the name of God—and that makes anything great."

Monsignor Sheen pointed out that a White House conference in 1940 disclosed that of the 30 million children in the United States between the ages of five and seventeen, about 16 million received no religious education whatsoever.

If America will be the hope of a postwar world, you will be the hope

of America. You have fitted yourselves for the task. From your ranks and from the ranks of the students of Catholic colleges and universities all over America must come leadership of thought and leadership of action in the generation ahead. That is your destiny: to lead a darkened world back into the light; to shape a world anew. There will be those among you, as there have been in all generations, who look upon the task as hopeless. The individual, they argue, is helpless to cope with what they like to call the "interests." That is a fallacy. The individual is not a puppet. His opinion is the final court of appeal in politics. The kind of leaders we get depends on him, since none can lead if he does not follow.

You can do something about it. You can do it by continuing to think for yourselves. Dictatorships are based upon the control of the public mind. In Nazi Germany, infinite pains have been taken to ensure that the common man shall think as the government desires him to think. The public mind is completely hemmed in and controlled by the most elaborate system of propaganda the world has ever seen. It begins in the nursery. The infant mind is "conditioned" to make it receptive to the ideas of the government. Through early childhood, in the schools, every word and every thought that reaches the young German are those words and those thoughts the party leaders deem desirable. Nothing is left to chance in the development

of a Nazi. Every book, every newspaper, every radio address, every play has a single objective: the formation of certain ideas.

IDEAS BEGET ACTIONS

Madman or genius or both, Hitler has grasped the principle that what the common man thinks is the first and last factor in politics. He has built a terrifying machine out of human minds, knowing that if you can control what a man thinks, you can control what a man does. Ideas beget actions, and the movement of ideas inaugurated by Hitler saw his ranks swell in the space of five years from a dozen fellow agitators to millions of abject slaves.

You will step from your classrooms into a shattered world. Yours will be a heritage of ailing minds and tortured souls, of starving bodies and confused thinking. Preparations are already under way to meet this challenge of the days ahead. This is as it should be. It is not your responsibility what forms these plans and preparations assume. It will be your responsibility to make them work or to alter them in your generation to fit the needs of that day. It is not enough, as I see it, to talk in terms of world courts and leagues of nations, of freedom of the seas and of the airplanes, of the rights of the minorities. We are still approaching these problems in the light of the science of government as we know it today. If we fail to develop the science of government, the tre-

mendous development in the other sciences will be effectively restricted.

The day of isolationism is gone forever from the world. No longer can nations rest content in their own little sphere, oblivious of everything beyond their geographical boundaries. But you cannot destroy nationalistic interests, the feeling of pride in one's race or homeland. You cannot foist, as I see it, your political beliefs upon others. If there is to be a United Nations of the World, it must be based upon the individual rights, duties and responsibilities of the nations and their peoples. I have no desire to burden you with the myriad forms this post-war thinking and planning are taking.

Even before the last shot is fired, these plans, or some plans, must be

set in motion. Time alone will prove which are feasible and which are not. You who are students today will be in the best position then to judge of their merits and demerits. It will be your voice that must be raised in protest when the evil forces attempt to assume control, if they do attempt to, of the international government. It will be your actions that must be brought into play to preserve the peace we are buying so dearly. It will be your leadership that, God willing, will prevent another world war a generation hence. Take your places in the world without fear. Take up the task from hands which failed. Keep faith with those who died in battle lest their sacrifice have been in vain.



Reciprocal Disarmament

As to the simultaneous and reciprocal disarmament desired by all, which is the real touchstone of peace and prosperity, the Holy Father, out of deference to the belligerent Powers, did not think well to set out in his letter the means for bringing about and continuing disarmament; he preferred to leave the determination of these to the Powers themselves. But he believes that the only means which are practical and not too difficult of acceptance are the following: Let there be an agreement among civilized nations, including the non-belligerents, to unite in the simultaneous and reciprocal suppression of obligatory military service; let there be a tribunal of arbitration to pronounce upon international disputes and let there be used, as a sanction, the isolation of any nation by all other nations, if it should attempt to reimpose obligatory military service, or should refuse to submit international questions to arbitration or accept the decision given.—

From a letter of Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State, to the British Prime Minister, September 28, 1917.

Belgian Hierarchy Assails Nazis

Text of Pastoral Letter issued March 21, 1943. N.C.W.C. News Service

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN:
To your present sufferings we must now add another which will be extremely painful for you; the occupying authorities inform us that they are going to proceed to the requisitioning of our church bells. Some months ago, in the face of the first menace, we presented to the German authority an energetic protest and enunciated the grave religious and juridical reasons against the seizure of the bells. On its part, the Holy See intervened with the Government of the Reich. We had hoped that, thanks to these interventions, the decision would not be put into execution. But now we learn with dismay that orders have been given to take the bells from our parish bellfries.

In the face of this unbelievable measure, it is impossible for us as Catholic Bishops responsible for the religious patrimony of our country not to raise our voice in public reproach and condemnation of this proposal. We reproach and condemn the seizure of our bells in the name of religion. The church bells are not merely so many objects of bronze. They have an exclusively religious purpose: they must not be used except in praise of God and to invite the Faithful to Divine services. They have been consecrated and sanctified by ritual benediction and, hence, are destined irrevocably to Divine worship. They cannot be

destined to profane use, nor taken without the consent of responsible ecclesiastic authorities.

We now solemnly declare that we oppose with all our Episcopal authority a measure which has no other purpose but that of transforming our bells into machines of war and instruments of death. It may be that in Germany and Italy the Bishops submit without protest to measures which they must condemn in their internal forum, just as we do; perhaps in their eyes patriotism excuses the tolerance of an evil which they cannot impede. For us, however, on the contrary, patriotic duty coincides with religious duty and our silence would constitute laxity and treason. Furthermore, the seizure of our bells constitutes a flagrant violation of international law stipulated by the Hague Convention and sanctioned by all civilized States.

Article 46 imposes upon the occupying authority the obligation of respecting the free exercise of worship; but the bells serve for the exercise of Catholic worship. Article 52 limits the requisitioning of property to the needs of the army of occupation. Now it is evident that the bells which will be seized will not be used by the troops of occupation. Finally, Article 56 consecrates the complete immunity of consecrated places of worship and prohibits all seizure to their detriment.

Thus, therefore, the written law of the nations prohibits the seizure of church bells by the occupying authority.

If the announced decision is carried out, history will say that it is the first time in the course of the centuries that this profanation, contrary to the manifest and recognized rights of religion, has been perpetrated in Belgium. Our Episcopal duty obliges us to declare that all collaboration in the seizure of the church bells is gravely illicit in conscience. We ask that all, priests and laymen, maintain a calm, purely passive attitude.

In the meanwhile there goes on what is called the "mobilization of Belgian labor," that is, the conscription of our population for forced labor in service of a Germany at war. We Bishops have protested to the occupying authority against these iniquitous measures. The high judiciary authorities of the country likewise have intervened. The King has multiplied his efforts to obtain withdrawal or mitigation of these ordinances. The Holy See has taken an interest in the question. But all without avail and effect.

The measures for the requisitioning of manpower are absolutely unjustifiable. They violate natural law, international law and Christian morality. They fail to take into account either the essential dignity and freedom of the human person or the welfare and honor of families, or the supreme good of society, which will suffer fatally from these sentiments of anger

and blind hatred sown in thousands and thousands of oppressed hearts.

The constraint imposed upon bodies and wills is serious, but the violence inflicted upon consciences is still more serious. Belgian citizens are obliged to cooperate, directly or indirectly, with the military operations of a foreign power which has unjustly imposed on their country a very severe occupational regime without giving them the slightest assurance for the future. Male workers, and especially female workers, are often placed in gravely harmful moral and religious conditions. Finally, despite their reiterated protests, your Bishops have not succeeded in obtaining an authorization to send chaplains to the exiles.

We are told that these measures are necessary to protect European civilization. But is this application of measures which violate the essential principles of all civilization, to defend, or is it not rather to destroy civilization? Human reason and Christian morality condemn and castigate these iniquitous and barbarous measures. All collaboration in the execution of these measures is gravely illicit in conscience.

Civilized nations, if they are informed of them, cannot fail to express their profound reprobation. At any rate, the Christian faith tells us the Almighty, Who is sovereign justice, is witness to what is happening. And it is before His tribunal that the acts of all human beings, without exception, will be judged in accordance with eternal laws.

Industrial Democracy

DR. R. A. L. SMITH

Reprinted from The SWORD OF THE SPIRIT, London, March 4, 1943.

THE report of the Sword of the Spirit sub-committee on Industrial Democracy, published in the January number of the *Bulletin* (Sword Paper, No. 12), poses a number of vital and urgent questions. Central to the whole social question of today is the major problem "How shall industry be governed? Shall it be ruled and controlled by directors—the salaried agents of shareholders? Or shall its government be entrusted to State officials—to salaried bureaucrats? Or finally—and men have only recently begun to ask the question—shall industry govern itself? That is to say, shall employers and workers cooperate in the government of industry through genuinely representative institutions?"

Now, the Catholic Church had given a decisive answer to this question long before the birth of the modern world. The medieval craft guilds, with all their many imperfections, represented a gallant attempt, under the inspiration and guidance of the Church, to give industry full self-government. At their best, in the thirteenth century, the craft guilds were truly democratic institutions which enabled master-craftsmen, journeymen and apprentices (the equivalent of our modern employers and workers) to engage in joint production.

Although the growth of monopoly and of capitalism undermined and destroyed the medieval craft guilds, the ideal of industrial self-government has never been abandoned by the Catholic Church. Pope Leo XIII raised his voice in the very heyday of unbridled capitalist individualism to affirm the need for the representation of the workers in the government of industry. His bold and courageous lead was largely ignored—and not least by Catholic employers. So Pope Pius XI thought it necessary to declare once more the mind of the Church on this matter. This he did in 1931 in his great Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. He deplored the fact that the wage-system divides men, on what is called the labor-market, into two sections, resembling armies, and the disputes between these sections transform this labor-market into an arena where the two armies are engaged in fierce combat. The Pope called for the establishment of "vocational groups . . . claiming the allegiance of men, not according to the position they occupy in the labor-market, but according to the diverse functions which they exercise in society. . . . These groups, with powers of self-government, are considered by many to be, if not essential to civil society, at least natural to it."

It is a remarkable fact that, under the stimulus of two world wars, the rulers of this country are being driven by the logic of events to endorse the Catholic position. But perhaps this should occasion no surprise. The Catholic Church is, after all, the greatest single repository of human wisdom as well as of Divine revelation. In times of great crisis, men who use their reason are therefore likely to adopt her teaching even if they arrive at it quite unconsciously and by an independent route.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that *the British Government is now beginning to promote in industry a general policy that has been advocated for centuries by the Catholic Church. It is the policy of industrial self-government.*

ORGANS OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

At the present time the organs of industrial self-government so far evolved in this country are in the main twofold. There are, *locally*, the *Joint Production Committees* in the factories, collieries, workshops and shipyards: *nationally*, the *Joint Industrial Councils* for whole industries. It is proposed to indicate briefly the progress that has so far been made in this country in the direction of industrial self-government and the fulfilment of Catholic teaching on this subject.

Before the Great War of 1914-18 there was little systematic consultation between the managers and workers of individual workshops and factories on

problems of production. When, however, the war revealed the imperative need for greatly increased production, managers often felt obliged to consult the workers on the ways and means of achieving this end. And so there arose spontaneously in this country in several different places joint committees of managers and workers. In 1917 the Whitley Committee strongly recommended the wide extension of this system of works councils. Accordingly, in the years 1918-20, works councils were established in well over a thousand firms and looked for a time like becoming an integral part of British industry.

But then enthusiasm languished. Many managers viewed the works councils with sullen hostility and suspicion and strove to impose strict limits upon their powers. The trade unions were also suspicious. In the early discussions, works councils were regarded by some workers' unions as a step towards a greater democratic control of industry, but the interest shown by these unions declined when it became clear that executive power almost always remained with the management and that the councils were consultative bodies with advisory powers only. So the years 1920-25 saw a rapid decline in the number and influence of the works councils. Although a few industries maintained them in being, works councils cannot be said to have played a vital part in British industrial life in the inter-war years. The reign of directors and managers was resumed

almost as if it had never been interrupted and the workers remained largely inarticulate on the daily routine of production.

The first eighteen months of this present war, in which the country was being purged by the ordeal of blood, tears and sweat from its chronic state of complacency, saw no very sensational experiments in industrial self-government. But then, as in the great war of 1914-18, the urgent demand for increased production once more began to induce the managers to consult the workers. And the Government strongly supported this action. The Pit Production Committees, representing miners and managers, were the first in the field. The Coal Production Council decided to set up these committees in the first year of the war, but the months after Dunkirk arrested the development as miners were then forced to leave the industry in large numbers in order to join the armed forces. In the spring of 1941, however, the Pit Production Committees were revived and by the summer of that year there was one in existence at nearly every pit. The Pit Production Committees, which are now closely paralleled by the Yard Committees in the shipbuilding industry, discuss the wide variety of questions relating to production at a colliery. They consider such matters as the use of transport and mechanization and receive specific suggestions from miners.

February, 1942 is a landmark in the history of British Joint Committees,

for then it was that the Ministry of Supply Industrial Council gave its signature to a constitution for Royal Ordnance Factories. Its object was to establish "a consultative and advisory Committee for the regular exchange of production, to increase efficiency for this purpose and to make recommendations thereon" in each of the Ordnance Factories. Illustrative of the questions to be considered and discussed are (a) maximum utilization of existing machinery; (b) upkeep of fixtures, jigs, tools and gauges; (c) improvement in methods of production; (d) efficient use of the maximum number of productive hours; (e) elimination of defective work and waste; (f) efficient use of material supplies; and (g) efficient use of safety precautions and devices. The committee is *not* to discuss matters which are trade questions. The superintendent of the factory or workshop is to be *ex officio* chairman of the Committee which is to consist of an equal number of representatives of the management and the workers, though not exceeding ten on either side. The election of the workers' representatives is to be conducted, by ballot, by the Trade Unions concerned. All organized workers, male and female, who have served for a period of not less than twelve months in a Royal Ordnance Factory are eligible for election to the Committee and every worker is entitled to a vote.

Thus the last year has witnessed the general establishment of Joint Production Committees in Royal Ordnance

Factories. A Central Joint Committee at the Ministry of Supply has exercised functions of supervision over this new and radical development. Results have fully justified this daring experiment in industrial democracy. Already, on April 25, 1942, highly satisfactory results achieved by the Joint Production Committees of the Royal Ordnance Factories were reported at a meeting of the Central Joint Committee of the Ministry of Supply. Increased production had gone side by side with the elimination of waste in the use of labor and materials. Evidence has since accumulated to show the wisdom of this new venture in industrial self-government.

PROGRESS NOTED

It would, of course, be unfair to judge private industry by the same standard as Royal Ordnance Factories, which are State-owned and State-controlled and thus have very different problems to face. Nevertheless, great strides have been made in private industry in the last year in the direction of industrial self-government. A constitution for Joint Production Committees almost identical to that of the Royal Ordnance Factories was accepted by the employers' and workers' unions of the engineering industry on March 18, 1942. Some three weeks later, on April 5, 1942, the Clerical and Administrative Workers passed a resolution at their Conference at Birmingham urging that members should be allowed to take part in Joint Produc-

tion Committees alongside manual workers. Since the first half of 1942 the movement has grown apace over a wide field of private industry. The results have been altogether beneficial.

Organized labor and Government spokesmen have given their unreserved support to the establishment of Joint Production Committees. At a joint meeting of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the National Executive of the Socialist Party in London on May 25, 1942, Sir Walter Citrine, general secretary of the T.U.C., said that the General Council had discussed the agreements for setting up Joint Production Committees in factories. He added that "The Trades Union Congress are carrying this a stage further and are setting up district production committees in a large number of selected districts—one hundred at least." Since then, Trade Union leaders have repeatedly affirmed their support of the principle of Joint Production Committees. And it was Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Aircraft Production, who declared in his broadcast to all engaged in the aircraft industry on December 20, 1942, that in every factory there should be a properly-run Joint Production Committee in which the workers, technicians and management take part, where efficiency and economy can be constantly under review. Everything goes to show that this new experiment in industrial self-government will be widely extended in the near future.

The national organization of repre-

sentatives of employers and workers of given industries in Joint Industrial Councils began in the Great War of 1914-18. In 1917 the Whitley Committee recommended the establishment throughout industry of "Joint Industrial Councils, which consist in equal numbers of employers and of workers in any industry." The subjects with which they were to deal were much wider than wages, hours and conditions of labor. They were to cover practically the whole field of industrial relations.

This ambitious scheme failed of realization. There was no legal sanction behind the system. The organization was entirely voluntary. Thus many great industries, such as coal-mining, iron and steel, engineering, shipbuilding and cotton textiles, neglected to establish the Joint Industrial Councils on the plea that their existing machinery for conducting relations between employers and workers was satisfactory. Some industries did, however, set up Joint Industrial Councils on Whitley lines, and these included printing, paper-making, flour milling, dock labor, pottery and various branches of the chemical industry. The Councils also gained a foothold in the public utility services and in public administration.

Between 1918 and 1921 some seventy-three Joint Industrial Councils were formed. Then, as in the case of the local works councils, the system broke down and several of these Councils ceased to function. In the inter-war years there were about fifty Joint In-

dustrial Councils in operation. But many of these covered a very limited area of industrial life and wielded no coercive authority.

Since the outbreak of the present war, Whitley principles have been gradually coming into their own again. Joint Industrial Councils have been increasingly active in a number of industries and the system has received official Government support. Speaking in the House of Commons on October 21, 1942, Mr. Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor, declared:

We have promoted on both sides of industry a policy of self-government in industry. There has been a gradual change over to what I think holds very great potentialities, namely, negotiations of a more representative character than the old method of bargaining. . . . The change towards the Whitley procedure has had a very good effect. . . . There is not a single industry that has ever come under the Trade Boards or under the Joint Industrial Councils which was not more prosperous afterwards than it had ever been before.

The Joint Production Committees in the factories and workshops. The Joint Industrial Councils to represent whole industries. These are the authentic instruments of industrial democracy.

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY

These very recent and remarkable developments in industrial democracy deserve the immediate and most earnest attention of all Catholics. There must be no repetition of the fiasco of twenty years ago when the instruments of democracy forged in the last war—the works committees and the Joint In-

dustrial Councils—were allowed to fall into disuse over a wide area of industry in the years after the war. The institutions which are built up in wartime should be enlarged and amplified *in times of peace*. The Joint Industrial Councils should be given full legal authority as the representative governing bodies of industry. Similarly, the Joint Production Committees should become universal in British industry and, from being purely consultative and advisory bodies, should gradually acquire full administrative and executive functions. The country will then be furnished with a genuine pattern of industrial democracy.

This general trend towards industrial self-government—the joint partici-

pation of the management and workers in the government of industry—is strictly in accordance with the Catholic teaching on society. For these modern developments express, albeit imperfectly as yet, an increased recognition of the unique value of human personality. As one writer puts it:

The workers, accepting the responsibility of full participation in the war effort, are beginning to think in terms of "we" instead of "they" and are proving that as efficient collaborators they can be far more than mere mechanical factors of production.

And does not the Church teach that man is created by God, redeemed by Christ, and nourished by divine grace? That he is uniquely valuable in the universe and master of his own destiny?



Sin of Silence

One of the ways in which we can partake in another's sin is silence. Not simply therefore have we to examine our speech during the day and look back to see that our language has been true and straight and kindly; but we have also to note how far by our silence we have allowed evil judgments or suggestions to pass by unchallenged. There is a well-remembered jest in *Punch* which speaks about "a profane silence." Silence can easily be unjust, cowardly, disloyal, as well as profane. A man may sit in company with others while his best friend's character is being destroyed and may rise and leave at the end without having said or done one thing against him; yet for all that he is, and knows himself to be, no friend at all, but thoroughly disloyal. Again, to listen while unjust things are said or planned or done—to listen without protest—is to share in the injustice. To stand idly by can, from the moral standpoint, be as wicked as actively to aid and abet.—*Bede Jarrett, O. P.*

The Church and Electric Toasters

RICHARD GINDER

Reprinted from THE TIDINGS, Los Angeles, March 19, 1943.

IS IT more important that a man have an electric toaster or that he keep the Ten Commandments? Which is the mark of greater culture? Not that people who have electric toasters don't keep the Ten Commandments, or that people who don't keep the Ten Commandments generally have electric toasters.

In fact, we're getting all fubbed up, and it's just because someone asked us, last week, why Catholic countries are so backward. At first we denied that Catholic countries are backward, but then we couldn't agree on what being backward meant. He thought it meant not having gadgets like electric toasters; and we thought it meant being selfish and pleasure-crazy.

When he spoke of France as a Catholic country, we had to admit at once that there are about 30,000,000 of the French who don't even make their Easter duty. Then when we mentioned the United States as a Protestant country, he laughed and said that 50,000,000 of us Americans don't go to church at all, and of those who do, half are Catholics.

For the sake of argument, though, we allowed that having money might mean progress and that lack of it could mean being backward. Of course, we spoke of Jesus at once. Then we brought out some of Our Lord's words about the rich: "Woe to you that are rich," and so on. And we told him how it was Dives and not Lazarus who had been condemned.

He said he had been thinking of England, which is Protestant and prosperous. We reminded him that Spain had once been prosperous, and Catholic. Then we spoke of Egypt, Assyria, Rome, and Greece, which had been pagan and prosperous. In fact, it seemed to us that "Every dog has his day," Catholic or Protestant; and if the countries of South America have been poor in the past, then they must be slated for great things in the future, Catholic or Protestant.

You can see that our argument didn't get very far. We think we had the last word, though. We told him that it isn't the business of the Catholic Church to make people rich and give them electric toasters; that if he can blame our Church for not doing those things, then we have just as much right to blame Franklin D. Roosevelt for not being able to turn us all into saints.

The Watcher in the Night of This Age

Under the above title RADIO VATICAN broadcast the following talk to Germany on March 2, 1943.

ON THE evening of March 2, 1939, the joyful message was announced from the Loggia of St. Peter's that the Church of Christ had again a supreme visible Head in the person of the then Cardinal Secretary of State, Pacelli.

The new Pope chose the name of Pius, thus indicating that he intended to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor, the great Pius XI. This was also shown by the similarity of their mottoes. Pius XI had chosen: "The peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ," and Pius XII: "Peace is the work of justice."

The joy caused by Pacelli's election not only among the people of Rome but all over the Catholic world was great indeed. Beyond that, Pacelli's election also caused lively satisfaction in non-Catholic circles. We still recall the word of a well-known Swiss journalist who formulated it thus: one could not say that the Church had received an exclusively religious or an exclusively political Pope. The right interpretation was probably to say that the new Pope was a happy combination of both—a pious diplomat. The new film "Pater Angelicus" which has been shown in Italy for the last two months and is received there with great enthusiasm evokes the memory of these days and hours. It was the period when the whole world turned

its gaze towards Rome and, watching anxiously the danger signals of coming conflict, put its hope in the moral power of the Papacy, which was in the hands of a man who was excellently prepared for the tremendous problems of the times. As Nuncio he had been personally in contact with nearly all the Great Powers of the world, and as Cardinal Secretary of State he had become thoroughly familiar with problems of Church Government. Moreover, he was endowed by nature with lovable qualities.

Now, on this anniversary, we ask ourselves: has Pius XII been able to fulfil the hopes raised by his accession to the Papal Throne?

To this question we can reply with an emphatic "Yes." It was not his fault that his efforts for peace were not crowned with success. All the world knows this by now. Today it looks to the Vatican with even greater hopes than four years ago. The world expects of the Holy Father, the greatest moral and religious authority on earth, that he should exert his whole religious, cultural and political power in tireless, sincere efforts, and regardless of persons and parties for the good of mankind. From the very day of his accession the Pope has endeavored to fulfil this task. It is well known nowadays that there

is no other power in which all can place the same, unlimited confidence.

It was not granted to the Pope—in spite of his utmost exertions—to save the peace. His broadcast appeal of August 24, 1939, was in vain. Deep into the hours of night, immediately before the Germans marched into Poland, the Pope endeavored to stave off disaster. Since then we have all learned what war means. What terrible distress it has brought down on Europe and mankind. What unprecedented clashes of philosophies. . . .

POPE IS FIRST TO SUFFER

Pius XII was the first to suffer under all these horrors. Night has fallen over Europe. The demon of war has been unleashed and brings untold misery to peoples and nations, to States and families. Its presence is regarded as license for all imaginable cruelties. The persecution of religion, the suppression of monasteries and religious houses, the closing of churches and schools, an unexampled disregard of the dignities and rights of the human personality, an unprecedented enslavement of human freedom, the deportation of thousands for forced labor, the killing of innocent and guilty alike, the extermination of cultural values hundreds of years old, the thwarting of the humanities (*Verkümmern der Geisteswissenschaften*), an unpardonable commandeering of human beings, especially of school and university youth, for the aims of the State that reigns supreme and has lost con-

tact with the laws of God. There is a lack of economic, political, social and moral steadiness and discipline, and an excess of instinctive and sensual sensibility, and too small a measure of firm principles and strong conviction. The Pope sees all that and raises his warning voice of protest. Above all, he suffers with the tortured people.

His sufferings, however, are not of a depressing kind. They are the sufferings of one who is full of hope. The Pope is an optimist, not of the reactionary type, waiting for the return of past ages. He says: "The watchword of the hour is not to bewail but to act." He knows that the Church, in its essentials, is not tied to any specific civilization. At the dawn of a new epoch he looks with confidence on the position of Christianity. For Christianity any age or civilization is nothing but the flour which must be permeated with the leaven of the divine word. He looks beyond Europe, his glance goes farther afield towards new and coming lands. Are they not ready? Do they not call for the Sower?

With the greatest attention, solely inspired by the love of Christ, the Holy Father's glance is today directed towards the Russian territories, in the Near and Far East, where great tasks and untilled soil are offering themselves to the future of Christianity. But so far he does not think that the ship of the Western world is sinking. Today the Western world has become ripe for missionaries; it is to this Western world which the Holy Father

is calling as the watchman in the night of this age, for this is truly what he is. In the night of the spirit his warning and challenging word shines like a beacon. With tireless zeal has the Holy Father laid down in his momentous pronouncements the ethical laws of regeneration. In spite of the fact that his first appeal was in vain, he never ceased renewing it, last time with a trembling voice, in May, 1942. At that time he spoke in the name of the huge congregation of families whose protector he calls himself. Nor should we forget the quieter diplomatic activity of the Holy Father and of the Vatican (*Stille Diplomatische Friedens-tätigkeit*).

WORKS FOR A JUST PEACE

But one thing is certain, the Holy Father is not aiming at peace for its own sake, he proclaims and works for a just peace in which the nations can really live. The light of his love is shining through the night of hatred. As he could not prevent war, he wants at least to alleviate its painful consequence.

The charitable activities of the Holy See during this war are an irrefutable proof of the victory of love. A Church which is able to do all that—even within the limits set to human effort—must conquer the hearts of man. Letters of thanks are arriving at the Vatican in their hundreds of thousands. They all mention the work of the Papal office for War Welfare which works for all—without any distinction

—who have suffered through this terrible war.

The Pope again and again asks the people to pray—he knows that this power avails more than anything else. Prayer is a factor in history. The Holy Father's personal confidence is an example not only to those who suffer. His call is: Do not despair, but look upwards. Believe in the crusade of a new era, proclaim a true and genuine crusade, a crusade of love and work, for a sheltered better human society, however difficult and distant may be the road that leads to it. Yes, the sufferings of the Vatican are no smaller than those of other countries. The days are not over yet, a hard lot still awaits the Holy Father, but he will remain at his post and lead his flock.

At Capua Antica in the Roman Campagna there is a small church called Domine Quo Vadis, in memory of the legend of Christ appearing to St. Peter on his flight. Peter asked him: "Lord, where art thou going?" "I am going to Rome to be crucified again." St. Peter understood, returned and did not evade martyrdom. This legend is profoundly symbolic. The Pope, the Vicar of Christ, has been placed on a road to Calvary. We proceed along the whole road, for in the Cross only is there salvation. Therefore, brothers, let us follow the Holy Father, let us suffer with him, pray for him and be faithful to him in unshakable Christian optimism.

Augustine Over Africa

EDWARD J. DUFF, S.J.

Reprinted from COLUMBIA, March, 1943

AMERICAN troops are not only making history these days, they are visiting lands where world history was made. The locale should occasion some lessons.

Take North Africa for instance. Near where one fork of our invading Army put ashore was fought the Battle of Zama which ended Punic War II (ominous thought!) and gave the flow of Western Culture its characteristic Roman stamp. Here centuries before the Phoenicians had come as traders and set up colonies that later under the Romans were to burgeon into cities of a brilliant civilization, Carthage with its half a million people vied with Mother Rome itself as the trade mart of the Mediterranean. Here were the birthplaces of literary figures whose provincial tongue lent salt to Latin letters. Here the Vandals set up a kingdom that scourged Italy and gave a new word to modern speech. Across this narrow littoral the Moslem Arabs had surged on their way to Spain and the conquest of Europe that nearly succeeded. Not far off the U. S. Marines in more recent time put an end to Berber depredations and won a new line to their glorious hymn. To these shores France came in the 19th century race for empire with its great colonial administrator, Marshal Lyautey, and the revered Cardinal Lavigerie, founder

of the White Fathers and exponent of Catholic acceptance of the Republic.

A storied land, famous for its martyrs and its memories of a glorious Christian past. And an object lesson for those who think wars settle nothing. Huneric, king of the Vandals, exiled 464 bishops. When Pope St. Gregory VII wanted to consecrate a bishop in Africa, after the desolation wrought by the Arab hordes, he could not find even three consecrating bishops.

Here, too, in a distant day the Church fought out its battle with aberrant forms and clarified the truth of Christ that is her eternal message and gift to men. And the massive mind behind several of these fights was that of St. Augustine who died just over 1,500 years ago at Hippo, now Bona.

Since Tagaste, the Saint's birthplace, is now a small stop on the coastal railroad that runs from Algiers to Tunis, the news dispatches that placed American troops at Bona, the seaport fifty miles to the north, on November 13, reasonably implied that the Yanks had arrived in time to celebrate Augustine's birthday in his home town. Dearly as he loved his episcopal city ("Hippo nostra," he called it), the warm-hearted Augustine might well be expected back at Tagaste (now Souk Arrhas) for the occasion, perhaps to preach a sermon in the basilica where

his boyhood friend, Alypius, was Bishop.

Had Augustine returned to a birthday party last November, what would he have made of these visitors from across the sea? That there were Catholics among the new arrivals would not at all surprise him. His knowledge of geography was as meagre as any of his contemporaries; Strabo's map provided the unquestioned picture of the world to the men of those days—a pie-plate world, the rim enclosing the land masses of Europe, a truncated Asia and North Africa, around which ran the river Occean. But the Saint knew that Catholicism was not a matter of numbers and square miles. The Church, he taught, is a living thing, expanding by an inherent necessity of its nature. Besides, he had assured his congregation that though the whole world was spanned by the Church (even some of the islands of the world-river having received the gospel) there were people living on the extremities of the earth, on the edge of the great ocean, still to be evangelized.

If there were colored troops in the American contingent, Augustine might have surmised that these were the unfortunate "Ethiopians" he had described. Would his astonishment on discovering that most of them were not yet Catholics be a reproach to Catholics at home?

Had Augustine returned home, we can be sure that there would have been high talk in the garden of Alypius' episcopal residence that night last fall.

There was high talk wherever Augustine was, human (and even humorous) efforts to plumb the abiding problems of life and the mysteries of God's way with men. We can easily imagine the possible setting: swarthy French colonials, American doughboys and their chaplains, with here and there a puzzled, if deferential, British Tommy, all seated under the olive trees beneath the bland African evening sky, listening and asking questions of the dark, bearded figure from the past.

WISDOM OF ST. AUGUSTINE

The scene recalls another birthday party of the Saint's, the one his mother, St. Monica, arranged at Cassiciacum in Italy after his return to the Faith in 386; but the present participants warrant us to suppose that questions more vital than the speculative disputations of the *Dialogues* at the villa outside Milan were sure to be broached. Though Monica's gentle presence and womanly common-sense might be missed at Tagaste in 1942, it would be an older, profounder Augustine than the convert-philosopher intent on reviving the symposia of the academies. Enriched by years of study on the mysteries of God (to say nothing of the centuries of contemplation of God's presence face to face in Heaven), tempered by the tasks of government of the Church in successive doctrinal and political crises, his capacious mind would be a reservoir of wisdom for the eager champions of liberty-in-arms today. And his vibrant soul, ever-con-

scious of his pastoral responsibility, would take a more than fatherly interest in the future of his new friends.

What an opportunity to learn from the master whom a Protestant critic preferred to call "the founder of Roman Catholicism" and to whom Christopher Dawson believes we owe "more than to any other individual the characteristically Western ideal of the Church as a dynamic social power."

AN AGE LIKE OUR OWN

Perhaps—had Augustine returned for that birthday gathering—he would have described for his visitors the crumbling world of the 5th century when the era of imperial exploitation came shattering to a close, its lack of purpose and spiritual bankruptcy revealed under the pressure of seething and unsolved social problems. It was a world in many ways not unlike our own: an age of magnificent public buildings and vast public works administered by a gigantic bureaucracy, a system that Mr. Belloc has tellingly called "The Servile State"; opportunities for "civilized" enjoyment were suddenly fostered and widely diffused for the better classes (and underneath it all, hopeless suffering and slavery); the meaning behind the public "religion" had gradually evaporated, to be replaced by a secularism that promoted pride and pleasure and corporate selfishness—and death. For life had gone out of the social body that was Roman civilization. The Saint might explain the shiver that went through the world when eternal Rome, the sym-

bol of the imperishable, fell to Attila's army and St. Jerome, anticipating Sir Edward Grey, exclaimed "the light of the world is put out."

But much more likely the talk would be about the present, about the role of the Faith on the contemporary scene. For the Truth, which Augustine had sought with the marrow of his soul, had been found. The answer to all his groping questions was discovered in the *Catholica*, the Church, the Universal thing—"the whole works" as some Jesuit-trained Yank might freely translate. And, having been found, it was to be communicated with all the passion with which it had been sought.

It might well be that from one whose whole thinking was a personal response to Truth, the teaching that November night might take the form of an account of the doctrinal evils he had faced in his time. They have their contemporary counterparts and the solutions the Saint reached have their lessons for American Catholics today. For it is errors about God and about God's plan for men that are at the bottom of our present distress.

Augustine, then, would talk about the meaning of evil, about the claims of Truth, about the nature and the mission of the Church, about the purpose of Christ and the need of man. In other words, he would be telling again the story of his life by recounting the errors he had fought: Manichaeism, pagan philosophy, Donatism, Pelagianism.

The Saint might begin by relating

how he went up to Carthage, at no small expense to his still pagan father and family friends, to do his higher studies. A brilliant, nervous young African he was and the uncontrolled life of a student in the metropolis was a heady experience. He joined a gang called the *Eversores* (which we might call "The Wreckers") and sowed wild oats aplenty, finally joining Manichaeism which held him in its dismal sway from his nineteenth to his twenty-eighth year.

THAT PESTILENTIAL TEACHING

How account for the spell of this exotic cult, contrived in the uplands of Persia a hundred years before, whose astonishing spread through the Roman Empire is a curiosity of history? It seems a mad enough doctrine to repel anyone—especially the young. Like many Eastern religions before it, it preached the fatalism of two principles, Good and Evil, contending for the rule of the world; free will was a myth; the secret "science" had been delivered to a long list of prophets (including Christ, of course) ending with Manes; finally, its program of "reason" was freedom from the superstition and authoritarianism of organized religion.

Later on, Augustine was to call it "that pestilential and empty-headed teaching" but at the time it offered an elaborate system of "scientific" abracadabra that tickled callow ignorance. Moreover, it had much of the appeal Herman Rauschnigg has pointed out in Nazism: it was the *Revolution of*

Nihilism. The neophyte was given the assurance that the responsibility for general woes and private failings was beyond human control; he had the dubious relief of knowing that "it is not we who sin but some strange nature in us." The dissatisfaction with life, the heavy feeling of frustration were due to an outside Source, The Principle of Evil. (Current translation, *The Jews, The International Bankers*, etc.) Always it was the external world, not the inner self, that was at fault. And over all brooded the dreary comfort of a blind fate.

Manichaeism was only one of the wild cults that filled the spiritual vacuum which the collapse of goals for living had created in the 5th century. It was the inevitable psychological response to general defeatism. The present Holy Father has spoken of false religions filling the modern "moral vacuum." And it is not extravagant to find similarities in Manichaeism to the nationalist paranoiac who seeks strength through submersion in the Brown Sewage (once called *The Wave of the Future*) and finds redemption in crying curses on the rest of the world. Despair that achieves salvation in a puritanical righteousness is an ugly (and formidable) creed.

The example has its lessons, too, for those in our own midst who think that liberty is automatically secured by crushing the Japs and Nazis, that the job of fashioning the world to the heart's desire is only a matter of re-

arranging mechanically external material conditions.

Augustine might go on to explain how he broke the chains of tyranny of matter by the influence of Neo-Platonism and, he would add, the prayers of Monica, his mother. At Milan, where he had gone to set up a school of Rhetoric, there was St. Ambrose of ancient Roman integrity and St. Simplicianus who put into his hands the books of Plotinus and Plato translated by another famous rhetorician, Victorinus, the martyr. The progress was from Plato to Paul—designed, Simplicianus assured him, by a special Providence. Here at long last was the answer to the vexing Problem of Evil. Evil, he learned, is a *lack*. And moral evil the price of misused liberty. To escape it, one must look beyond the things of sense and enter into one's self to find light.

The philosopher provided a vision of Transcendent Truth of whose reality and beauty visible things were only a distant glimpse. But the light, pure though it be, was a cold light, as unsatisfying as trying to warm one's freezing fingers under the rays of the moon. Much was the talk of the word of God in these books, but that the Word was made flesh and humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death—of this there was nothing. Yet it was a beckoning candle that led to the Light that shone in a darkness, the Light that is Life and once throbbed in a living Heart that rested on the breast of the great Platonist, St. John.

And so Augustine was forced to face the claims of Catholicism where alone were taught the vibrant truths that could tame the turbulent flesh. The tumult of temptation was quelled in the well-known incident of the *Confessions*, when amid the scourging of conscience he opened the book of the Scriptures and read: "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ and take no thought for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof." The prayers of gentle Monica were at length answered; the child of those many tears had indeed not been allowed to perish. Augustine was baptized by Ambrose and slowly the little party started home for Africa.

It was at Ostia, while waiting for the boat, that Monica died, desiring nothing further from life, caring not at all where her body might be laid so long as remembrance of her was made at God's altar.

CONQUERS DONATISM

Here in the lovely garden of ancient Tagaste Augustine might continue telling his listeners of his bootless plans to settle down to a life of study and contemplation. The cries of the people insisted he be made a priest and, later, a bishopric was thrust upon him. His installation at Hippo brought him immediately into contact with schism and for thirty years he fought it with every weapon in his intellectual armory until he had broken it decisively.

The schism was Donatism and for a hundred years it had flourished in

North Africa. It is unlikely Augustine would delay to explain to his 20th century visitors the origins of the schism (in which the offended "piety" of a wealthy woman had played no small part) nor of the campaign of arson, pillage and calumny with which it persecuted the Church (though he might jokingly recall the time the schismatics organized the bakers of Hippo not to deliver bread to Catholics). It is much more probable, however, that Augustine would use the incident of the Donatist trouble to speak to moderns on the issue of Unity, a theme that was for him almost an obsession. For Catholicity is Unity, one as Christ is one, so that the Saint does not hesitate to use the world as a substantive—"Unity sanctifies us."

This universalism of the Church made no appeal to Donatism which prided itself on being a frustrated Catholicism and was willing to limit the world-Church to the dimensions of a sect or, worse still, a club for snobs. It boasted that it alone (the assertion turns up regularly in history) was the Church of the "pure," of the "saints"—the rest of the Church having fallen from grace. Quite consonant with this bland arrogance went the assertion (later, too, repeated in history) that the efficacy of the Sacraments depends on the sanctity of the priest administering them. Most offensive of all to the mind of Augustine was the particularism of the sect, its determination to settle all issues "inter Afros" to enclose the expanding Church "as if all other people

were lost" and its contentment to limit the scope of Christ's redeeming work to a corner of the globe.

Whatever its political prepossessions (they seem roughly anarchistic), the spiritual theory of the Donatists was intransigently isolationist. It is no dead doctrine in the modern world, for (to speak of a less embarrassingly contemporary Catholic attitude than the lack of proportionate interest in the Missions) Cardinal Wiseman found in Donatism a telling comparison with the English national religion that shattered Newman's *Via Media* position and started him on his path to Rome.

THE BODY OF CHRIST

To the perennial danger of exclusivism of faith, Augustine might repeat today his old appeal to the universal Catholic Church, as vast as the world, one as Christ is one, destined to embrace the whole *orbis terrarum* in its ample bosom. It was not the feeble extent of their territory that he mocked in the Donatists but their neglect and contempt of the Divine purpose of Holy Mother Church to reveal to all men, of all races and classes, their lost spiritual unity and to restore it. *Catholic*, he might recall, means *whole*, signifying the global destiny of the Church to "unite all citizens, all peoples—what shall I say,—the entire human race by belief in the community of our origin, so that no longer content merely to associate together, men become, so to speak, brothers."

"I do not know who placed the

boundaries of charity in Africa," he once observed with irony. Catholicism is definitely for export and there might be advantage in explaining Christ's warning of "trading till I come" to the Yanks. The Bishop of Hippo had traded with ingenuity and vigor, presenting the vision of the Body of Christ to the schismatics by constant preaching, letters, hand-bills (wall posters even) and public discussions. For the Faithful he wrote a rhyming verse in acrostics on the history of the schism, to be committed to memory. And, perhaps most significant of all, he did not hold that theological controversy was the privileged preserve of the clergy; he would have the laity, too, take their part in affirming and defending the Faith. Under such leadership is it any wonder that his biographer, Possidius, wrote: "With the advent of Augustine the Church in Africa began to lift up its head."

LAST CHALLENGE OF PAGAN THOUGHT

As the soft African night drew on, St. Augustine might relate the events and issues of his last great doctrinal fight, the one that was still occupying him when death found him, pen in hand, in the third month of the Vandal siege of his episcopal city.

The heresy was Pelagianism. And the contest was a crucial one that clarified the essential nature of Christianity and distinguished it decisively from all "ways of life"—no matter how noble, how attractive. The last challenge of the best of pagan thought was faced

and refused. Uprightness of character, enlightened views, high purpose are not enough. The Good Pagan failed 1,500 years ago; his lifeless smile is as empty (if heroic) today—the Editors of *Time* and *Fortune* notwithstanding.

It was no easy fight, this contest with the made-over Stoic secularism that tried to engraft itself on the Christian body. The prestige of Pelagius was tremendous. An Englishman of imposing stature and impressive gravity, his stern visage won him a following in the halls of the first-families of Rome, where his challenging eloquence inveighed against mediocrity of living, the tyranny of riches and summoned his hearers to costly effort, unrelenting discipline in the following of Christ. It was muscular Christianity of a sort but surely not of the vulgar kind: Pelagius was a director of souls who confidently expected to leaven the mass of the Faithful and stir them to the higher life by the shaming example of his disciples. It was a doctrine of Progress—of individual progress by strenuous moral endeavor, or social progress unto the integral perfection of all mankind by the leavening of an elite.

Pelagianism, let us say at once, was noble. It emphasized the imperious character of the Divine law; it undoubtedly achieved (as indeed it presupposed) great strength of character in its adherents; its success was a reproach to the slackness of the post-persecution Christian effort.

It was all of these fine things. And it was vicious.

For it was Christianity without Christ, the Faith robbed of its two core mysteries, Original Sin and Redemption. It was Catholicism without the doctrine of Grace—which is to say it was the most sterile (and cruel) ethical teaching imaginable. The example of Christ as the Great Educator is doubtless inspiring. But the following of Christ is a treacherous course if conceived as a contest by which man of his own ascetic efforts and study shapes himself towards divinity. Such a venturesome struggle (doomed though it be) may be impressive as an ideal; surely as a picture it is flattering to human pride. Unfortunately (rather, *fortunately*) it is not Christian. Christianity is essentially the uncompromising assertion of human helplessness supported and at every instant interiorly strengthened by the Divine assistance.

For Augustine the Pelagian heresy was a problem of the fundamental point of the Faith; it was no grammarian's debate, no campaign of personalities—"I have heard his name spoken with great respect," he said of Pelagius. But it was a life and death struggle and he recognized it as such from the outset.

The problem was complicated by the unquestioned reverence of the heretics for the person of Christ and by their liberal use of the word "grace"—by which they meant the common and natural gift of reason and free will and all the external helps the example of Christ and His teachings offered for

autonomous human moral effort. Not far distant, this, from the religion of Cicero who thanked the gods with due homage for the goods of fortune and farm but for the triumphs of virtue reserved his praise for the conquering will of man.

Augustine brought the issue to the center of things: to the solidarity of mankind in the sin of Adam, the first father, which left the human race a huge invalid stretched helpless over the entire face of the earth. Privation of unowed gifts with resulting moral impotence, such is the bequest of Adam. But not forever did God abandon man. By a like solidarity, wounded man was caught up in Christ and in a totally gratuitous reversal of the process, interiorly renewed.

NEED GOD'S GRACE

Nor was the work of the Saviour completed by the quashing of the indictment against us, by the annulling of the curse of Adam's sin. Entering into the mass of redeemed mankind by Baptism, the Christian stands every instant in need of God's ever-present grace to illumine his mind and stiffen his will that he may tend towards the good. He must even pray for the grace to pray. Utter and everlasting dependence on God's essential aid operating in the depths of the soul, such is the protestation of the Catholic creed.

No flattering contract, then, between two equal parties is the religion of Christ; no code of correct deportment no matter how disinterested: but

the ready admission of human helplessness and the affirmation that it is God who initiates and carries through all our activities that have value on the spiritual level of living. Augustine summed up this essential point of the Faith when he prayed: "Give us the strength to do what You command and then command what You will."

There is today much talk of refashioning the world into a home of freedom and human brotherhood. What the Nazi *New Order* would be we can easily see through the smoke of the bombing of defenseless cities and the riddled figures of murdered hostages and the starved faces in occupied countries. Our program is, we boast, wholly different. We would make a civilization founded on Christian truth and inspired by Christian values. These are splendid sounding declarations but there is need to remember always that the characteristic stamp of the Christian spirit is its thorough-going realization that of ourselves we can do nothing, that so completely are we dependent on God that our high hopes for the post-war world are already doomed unless the peace is of His making to which we lend ourselves as His willing cooperators.

St. Augustine's influence, historians

tell us, was at work all through the bleak centuries when, beneath the topsoil of new barbarian peoples of Europe, another civilization was being born that flowered in the cultural richness of the Middle Ages. As the visitors took their leave of the Saint in Alypius' garden at Tagaste (so we have supposed) to go back to their battle-stations, they would surely have much to think about, much that is important for the tasks of the future. They might kneel for the blessing of the man who has been called the Bridge-builder from one age to another but for whom civilizations themselves were only counters in the eternal drama of the ways of God with man where two Cities are constantly abuilding, each the product of contrary desires. "Two loves built two Cities (he wrote)—the earthly, which is built up by the love of self to the contempt of God, and the heavenly, which is built up by the love of God to the contempt of self."

Those words might well be St. Augustine's final lesson and message. The kind of post-war world we will have will be determined by the kind of heart we have, by the kind of spirit we bring to the task—one that offers itself to God as His instrument or spurns His eager assistance.



The Issue

For God or against God, this once more is the alternative that shall decide the destinies of all mankind, in politics, in finance, in morals, in the sciences and arts, in the state, in civil and domestic society.—Pius XI in *Caritate Christi Compulsi*.

Is Gandhi Another Dictator?

L. A. FOSTER, S.J.

Reprinted from JESUIT MISSIONS, April, 1943.

TOTALITARIAN states have naturally enough given birth to the totalitarian man or the dictator. This was so in the Axis powers even before the war and now it is a fact in practically all countries, for there must be dictatorial powers in time of war for quick and efficient maneuvers.

India, too, has its quasi-dictator, though he would never hear of such a title. It is Mahatma Gandhi, that is, the Reverend or the August Gandhi. Even now here in God's country (India) he is considered sort of a god, by the Hindu people at least, and will be apotheosized after his death, placed in the pantheon of the gods, just another one added to their million. Gandhi has been in the limelight for a long time, in fact, he is the oldest in point of age and service among the dictators of the world.

"Why should this man have become a god?" asks Shakespeare. How can one account for Gandhi's present position in India and the world? Is it because of his simplicity of life and ideas, his sincerity and desire to help men, especially the 60,000,000 depressed Hindus of the country? Is it his development of the doctrine of non-violence, or his spinning wheel and other social reforms? Does his profession, ever on his lips, of seeking after truth make him world-famous?

Has his renown spread because of what he has done or simply because of the man? Is it in other words something objective or subjective that has made him a light in the world?

I would say that it is something of all these things and not due to one alone. It is because he is the great politician here in India, the radical social reformer and the religious ascetic. It is the man with his ideas and aspirations, his thoughts and affections, his feelings and imagination; it is Gandhi the man. For like all famous men, there must be something about him which brought him into prominence and placed him on a pedestal.

In this short article, we shall consider Gandhi's ideas about truth and especially religious truth. He has always professed that he is a seeker after truth; it is his great desire, and with him even a religious desire, to come to the knowledge of the truth. He even calls his autobiography *My Experiments with Truth*. The first thing to be noted is that he admits that he has not the truth, that he is seeking it, desiring it and this is so most especially again of religious truth. And strange as it may seem, this does not mean that he is not an orthodox Hindu, for he is, and in Hinduism, it has been said, there is no such thing

as heresy. In fact, that can be said of almost any religion except Christ's Church.

An all important thing to be noted about Gandhi's idea of truth is that it is perfectly subjective, for truth to him means that what he feels about a subject, what he thinks about it, is true. It amazes one who reads his writings to see how Gandhi makes his truth the only truth, and everything else is false. He is most egocentric and self-opinionated, a real egoist. There is no use then trying to convince such a man; he is bound up in a circle, the narrow circle of his subjective self. He is constantly denying objective truth, denying that whether he thinks or feels or imagines this or that, there is such a thing as truth outside of him, what we would call objective truth. We sometimes call such a man hard names, a bigot, a dreamer, a fadist, and actually I think these terms can be applied to the great Mahatma, though it would seem that he is sincere in his dreams and imaginings and believes most whole-heartedly in Gandhi.

Another fundamental doctrine with him is that we are always progressing towards truth. It is the theory of evolution carried out in the intellectual and even in the spiritual world. We must always be seeking truth, because no one has the truth; we must experiment in order that we may come to the truth. While we as Catholics would admit this principle in part, we must say, of course, that

it is stupid to apply it to all religious truth as Gandhi does openly in his writings.

In the quotations from his book which we shall give below, the reader can notice how truth for him is always something subjective and it is developing. These ideals are supposed in all his writings, so it will not be necessary to demonstrate what we are saying here by multiplying quotations.

GANDHI'S RELIGIOUS IDEAS

It is his religious ideas and especially his views with regard to missionary work that we shall examine. Gandhi always maintains that one religion is as good as another and one as bad as another, and, therefore, there is no such thing as infallible truth with regard to religious belief. The Bible is on the same level with the Mohammedan Koran and the Hindu Gita. They are all revealed religious truths, but not to be taken as infallible authority. Though they are revealed truths, they are imperfect because they come to us through men and, therefore, all must be interpreted by the individual. So naturally enough, according to him, we are on our way in religion, trying to arrive at truth, evolving truth from all scriptures.

We quote from his book, *Christian Missions*, which bears the subtitle, "Their Place in India" published by the Navajivan Press of Ahmedabad, in 1941. This book is a selection of his writings and speeches about the mission idea. A quotation will make this

dear. We quote the extract on page four, called "Tolerance, i.e., Equality of Religion." He says:

And if we are imperfect ourselves, religion as conceived by us must also be imperfect. We have not realized religion in its perfection, even as we have not realized God. Religion in our conception being thus imperfect, is always subject to a process of evolution and re-interpretation. Progress towards Truth, towards God, is possible only because of such evolution. And if all faiths outlined by men are imperfect, the question of comparative merit does not arise. All faiths constitute a revelation of Truth, but all are imperfect and liable to error. Reverence for other faiths need not blind us to their faults. We must be keenly alive to the defects of our own faith also, yet not leave it on that account, but try to overcome those defects. Looking at all religions with an equal eye, we would not only not hesitate but would think it our duty to blend into our faith every acceptable feature of other faiths.

This long quotation shows Gandhi's mind quite perfectly with regard to development in religion. The book is filled with such subjectivism and the "we" and "us" mean, of course, "I." In the selection entitled "A Strange Seeker," page 166, he says:

Well, I go further, and tell you that religion is one and it has several branches which are equal. . . . But I suggest a better position. Accept all religions as equal for all have the same root and the same laws of growth. . . . Unless I accept the position that all religions are equal, and I have such regard for other religions as I have for my own, I would not be able to live in the boiling war around me.

From these false assumptions he argues logically enough—we do not maintain that he is never logical—that faith must come only by reason; it is a reasoning process, and that religion

is never to be preached but is only to be lived. It is a life and not capable of being put into words. He says:

Try to preach the principles of Christianity to my wife. She can understand them no better than a cow. I can, because of the training I have had. . . . The only way I can supply my neighbors' spiritual needs is by living the life of the spirit without even exchanging a word with him. . . . All I want them (Christians) to do is to live Christian lives, not to annotate the gospels. . . . To live the gospel is the most effective way. Preaching jars on me and makes no appeal to me and I get suspicious of missionaries who preach.

And that from Gandhi who is always preaching and employing propaganda methods in his various organs!

TYPICAL OF HINDUISM

His final conclusion with regard to missionary work is that conversions should not be attempted, for converts cannot be made:

Well it is no use trying to fight these forces without giving up the idea of conversion, which I assure you is the deadliest poison that ever sapped the fountain of truth. . . . I would not only not try to convert but would not even secretly pray that anyone should embrace my faith. . . . Just forget that you have come to a country of heathens and think that they are as much in search of God as you are; just feel that you are not going there to give your spiritual goods to them, but that you will share your worldly goods of which you have a good stock. You will then do your work without mental reservation and thereby you will share your spiritual treasures.

This is Gandhi, the religious Gandhi, the man who experiments with Truth. He is the typical Hindu also, who sums up in himself the religious

atmosphere of India. One of our thoughtful and experienced missionaries after reading *Christian Missions* remarked that it shows Gandhi to be a real Hindu. He meant that Gandhi's ideas and missionary attitude are typical of Hinduism, which is a religion that has personal, subjective and eclectic dogma and in which objective truth is quite disregarded. Is it any wonder, then, that the work of turning the people of India to God, that is, giving them the Truth, is so difficult and naturally impossible without the grace of God?

Gandhi might even be said to be a good Protestant, for it is characteristic of Protestantism to believe what you will, make your own moral code and deny objective religious truth and what it connotes, authority. One last quotation, a conversation with a Protestant missionary.

Missionary: "You are really a Protestant?"

Gandhi: "I do not know what I am or am not. Mr. H. will call me a Presbyterian."

Missionary: "Where do you find the seat of authority?"

Gandhi: "It lies here (pointing to

his own breast). I exercise my own judgment about every scripture including the Gita. I cannot let a scripture text supersede my reason. Whilst I believe that the principal books are inspired, they suffer from a process of double distillation. Nothing comes from God directly."

So Gandhi is wrapped up in Gandhi, with his own personal and subjective ideas about God and our relationship to Him. He will not, he cannot be jarred out of them. He has good faith, I'm sure, but it is not true faith—he is sincere, I hope, but that's not the same as saying he possesses Truth. One thing is certain, Gandhi is far from being a Catholic, for he spurns objective truth and what necessarily goes with it, authority and submission to God.

This frail little man is typical of the Hindu peasant raised to the *n*th degree of intellect—shrewd, simple, stubborn, a very child of India. Until his recent fast he remained the dominant figure in Indian politics. Though he failed to achieve his point Mahatma, with his loin cloth and his toothless smile, has not yet passed out of the Indian picture.



If you rely more upon your reason and cleverness than upon the virtue of submission to Jesus Christ, you will not become an enlightened person; for God wants us to be perfectly submissive to Him and to give up our own feeling and judgment through burning love for Him.—THE FOLLOWING OF CHRIST, by Gerard Groot.

THE EDITORIAL MIND

The Safety of the Vatican

REPORTS emanating from Washington have it that protests pour into Senator Tom Connally, chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, against RAF bombings of what they call "suburbs" of Rome—that is, places within about twenty miles. All such protests say that Rome must not be bombed, bombings this close to the Vatican must be stopped.

We are happy to see this solicitude and interest on the part of our American citizens. Our Holy Father certainly did all possible to prevent this war. He has been grieved considerably by its cruelty. He has persistently labored in behalf of peace since the start of this conflict. He is presently striving for the relief of war-torn peoples and lands. To do anything that even vaguely threatens Our Holy Father's safety would be but to blot the escutcheon of our cause.

Some writers recognize Our Holy Father's right to safety but suggest that he vacate Rome for the duration. For they say Rome is hiding under the shadow of the Cross on St. Peter's. But we would remind such editorialists that the Pope is a temporal sovereign as well as spiritual head of the Catholic Church, and even though his territory

is small and contiguous to the enemy, he has the right to remain in his territory unharmed by forces to which he has given no offense. We do not for a moment think that any one professing to be a Christian would want to see a city which holds so many Christian memories bombed. Bombing the Eternal City will do more damage than merely shattering buildings, temples and towers of religion. It will bewilder the minds and hearts of millions of brave men and women throughout the world who are paying "the last full measure of devotion" to re-establish the right to live, to pray and to think within the wide circumference of freedom all over the wide spaces of the earth. Let Rome be safe.—*The CATHOLIC STANDARD AND TIMES, Philadelphia, April 23, 1943.*

Jefferson and Rights

THE tributes being paid to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, as the country celebrates the 200th anniversary of his birth, center about the imperishable line in the Declaration of Independence, credited to him, proclaiming the fact that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights"; this is cited as our charter against tyranny, against

interference with the individual's dignity and freedom. But even those who quote these words seem often to lose sight of the authority upon which the rights thus proclaimed depend. Jefferson is not the authority from whom we derive our rights, although he worded the doctrine; the Declaration of Independence is not the authority, although it was signed by the fathers of the nation; neither is the Constitution, which later was drawn up to give force and application to the principles of the Declaration and was formally approved by the States of the Union. Jefferson named the Power from which our rights are derived—the Creator—and the acknowledgment of God's dominion, thus expressed by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, carries inescapably the duty of obedience and allegiance to God.

Unless a recognition of man's obligations to God accompanies man's assertion of the rights conferred upon him by God then a misunderstanding of the things for which Jefferson stood is evident. And therein lies a grave danger to the Republic, a danger which Jefferson foresaw, and warned against in one of his other writings. When we quote the Declaration's proclamation of man's rights, we would do well to quote also these lines by the same patriot who phrased the Declaration: "God, Who gave us life, gave us liberty; can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed, I tremble for my

country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever." —*The PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC, April 15, 1943.*

One Hairshirt or Another

A PRESS service recently reported it as a great curiosity that hairshirts are still being made by a Religious community in England. The tone of the article was one of amazement that, in this day and age, anything so quaint as hairshirts should even be thought of. Here is an index of the temper of the times.

The nature and the need of penance are largely unknown to the world of today. The senses and appetites of the body, far from being restrained and chastised in order to keep them subject to the will, are given free rein. They are uninhibited and treated as if they were meant to be sovereign in the governance of human life. The Christian view is that they are disorderly and insatiable and likely to work our ruin if not checked and strictly ruled by our higher faculties. To keep them under control and to expiate the sins in which they have had a large share of commission or connivance, they are to be disciplined.

The irony of the thing is that, unless we do voluntary penance, we shall have unchosen and unwanted penance thrust upon us in abundance. This war is a vast and terrible hair-shirt forced on a world which has denied moral responsibility, the possibility of sin and its malice. The tor-

ment which it inflicts is exquisite and prolonged. Until we cease to wonder and laugh at the hairshirt and what it represents, we shall continue to be frightfully scourged by the consequences of our moral and spiritual blindness and waywardness.—*The CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, Hartford, Conn., April 15, 1943.*

Catholic Cynics

THE Holy Father, it is clear, encourages the hope, indeed the faith, that "war" as we know it will one day cease to trouble mankind. One must needs define one's terms. It is not to be expected that quarrels, misunderstandings, stupid antagonisms will be eliminated from international or human relationships. Original Sin is a fact that has to be faced; and the Devil knows his job. But that is not to say that war as we at present know it must necessarily persist. Just as slavery in its crudest form may be abolished, and yet may persist in a more subtle form, so war in its crudest form may be abolished and yet may persist in a less obscene and cruel form.

The day in fact may come when argument between nations will no longer be conducted by the competitive bombing of babies. It may be conducted by the competitive wangling of diplomats within the four walls of an international and supernational council-chamber, the losing party being condemned to the loss, for instance, of

its former control over an important raw material. The essence of the thing may be as sordid, the motive as selfish, yet its incidence and effect may be less of an atrocity than the air, sea and land warfare which at the present stage threatens to destroy civilization.

The Catholic attitude to war and to its inevitability is a hard nut for non-Catholic idealists to crack. How many Catholics themselves understand it? There is a type of hard-boiled Catholic, consciously accepting his dose of Original Sin, or, shall we say, of original humanity, who leans back in his chair and remarks: "Obviously you are never going to make the cat kinder to the mouse." He leaves it at that, and is highly pleased with himself. When the bombs fall upon the babies—and upon the grown-ups too, which is just as bad—he shrugs his shoulders and says, with the French cynic he remembers reading: "*Que voulez-vous? C'est la guerre!*" The danger to such a Catholic is that by ceasing to hope for anything better, he ceases to work for anything better.—*George Glasgow in the CATHOLIC TIMES, London, March 13, 1943.*

Pope's Program Catching

BASIC points in the program for a lasting peace outlined by Pope Pius XII are meeting with wider acceptance as time goes on.

A striking instance is a memorandum on a "just and durable peace"

issued by the Geneva office of the World Council of (Protestant) Churches. The memorandum declares that Jesus Christ is Lord over all men and all powers. It calls on society to provide all its members with the opportunity to fulfil a meaningful vocation. It states that the nations are interdependent and that all must have access to the resources of the earth.

Another program recalling the Pope's repeated declarations on peace is the "Pillars of Peace" recently put forward by a commission of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, a Protestant organization. Most of the "pillars" are similar to the points in the peace program of Pius XII.

With Christianity under assault by powerful totalitarian governments, atheistic educators and irreligious writers, it is heartening to see leading Protestant organizations agree in principle with the Holy Father on some fundamentals of a sound post-war order in the world—*The MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit, April 22, 1943.*

Good Will Not Enough

THERE are plenty of good Americans who would like to see the Negro forever freed from the shackles that continue to bind and oppress him. They have the best will in the world toward a race that still labors under handicaps that are not only unde-

served, but wholly out of place in a democratic society.

They act and think kindly, these well-intentioned Americans; but they are to the point of fatuousness if they believe that passive good will is sufficient to overcome the evils they lament.

The hard truth is that the Negro will most likely stay where he is so long as white men and Negroes alike substitute empty wishing for struggle and effort. If interracial goals of justice and equality are to be reached it must be through a policy of constant action and effort. That does not imply an offensive aggressiveness, but patience, persistence and high purpose.

Courage is needed, the kind of steadfastness exemplified by a young white soldier in a Southern city when he refused to vacate a seat he shared with a Negro buddy in a Jim Crow street-car. He was threatened by the motorman and by some white passengers, but would not budge. Obeying a law infinitely higher than any Jim Crow decree, this young American soldier showed what it meant to be a real democrat and a real American.

The total eradication of racialism from American life demands that kind of courage. Let us cherish good will in our hearts; but let us also have that high loyalty to the commands of God that make us ready at any moment to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Negro in testimony to the Faith that is in us.—*The INTERRACIAL REVIEW, February, 1943.*

The Age of the Catholic Layman

THOMAS J. ROSS

Speech delivered at the Eleventh Annual Communion Breakfast of the Regis Alumni Association, New York City, March 14, 1943.

THE FIRST generation of Regis men have set standards since graduation which any school of many generations of sons would be proud to attain. And never in history has any other generation had to deal with a complete cycle of world war to world war in a quarter century.

When the first Regis High School students began to accompany Caesar through the three parts into which all Gaul is semi-annually divided, the so-called civilized nations of Europe were embarking upon World War I. When the first graduates of Regis High School proudly stepped up to get their diplomas, four years later, that war was going pretty badly for our side. America's weight was just beginning to tip the scales in our favor. Now that first class approaches the year of its twenty-fifth reunion and some of these are engaged in a global war of even more colossal proportions.

In the intervening years, successive classes of Regis men have entered upon their careers. I am told that seventy-five per cent of Regis graduates normally go on to college. You no doubt are aware that about 250 of them have been blessed with a call to the priesthood—perhaps a greater percentage than that of any other school—many of them Jesuits, some Diocesan clergy,

Dominicans, Redemptorists, Franciscans and Maryknoll missionaries. It is a thrilling record! As your Service Flag shows, 415 Regis men are now in the armed services of their country and I am told at least five of these have given their lives for it. Regis men are in the learned professions and in many commercial, financial and industrial walks of life.

What interested me most, however, in looking forward to this occasion is that Regis Alumni, through their association, are setting a pattern of activities as Catholic men, not only for which there is greater need today than ever before, but which indicates in practical ways how that need can be effectively met if Catholic laymen are alive to their opportunities, to say nothing of their obligations. In the bewilderment which stuns the thinking of so many people today these are the things that really count. As Catholic men we need not be so stunned ourselves. What is going on in the world around us should be regarded as a challenge. It affords us a splendid opportunity which you men in your Alumni Association work have accepted.

I am not a student of Church history in America, but it seems to me that the period in which we are living

is rightly to be called the Age of the Layman. Never before in this country, or perhaps anywhere else in the world, have there been so many Catholic lay organizations. This is a healthy condition. It is a logical development of Catholic activity in the United States since Colonial times.

We had in the early days of the Colonists and in the years thereafter, here and throughout the West, the age of the missionaries. You will not find more inspiring history than that of these missionaries, many of whom were martyred in their work. As a matter of fact, in many of the colonies a Catholic found it difficult to live unmolested until after the Revolutionary War. Charles Carroll of Carrollton was the only Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence.

Then, you might say, came the age of other religious pioneers when, in many parts of the country, the ability to ride horseback was a priestly qualification and it was not unusual for a bishop himself to make the bricks for his own church. This was followed by the great builders—builders of cathedrals and churches and schools—organizers of Religious congregations and Catholic organizations of men and women in many homogeneous groups. Their work gave us the great organizations of Catholics today, such as the National Council of Catholic Men, the National Council of Catholic Women, the Knights of Columbus, the Sodality, the Holy

Name Society, the Catholic Daughters, the Newman Clubs, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and, in our own day, the Catholic Youth Organization, the Catholic Evidence Guilds, the Catholic Lawyers and Actors Guilds and many others.

TIME OF NEW OPPORTUNITY

It is estimated that some seven million men are enrolled in such Catholic lay organizations and probably an equal number of women. It requires no great stretch of the imagination to realize the impetus toward sound thinking which this body of men and women would give if their influence could be effectively articulated in our everyday affairs. That is one reason why I believe this is rightly called the age of the layman. I mean it in the sense that this is a time of new opportunity for the layman to live up to his civic obligations; that is, to give a good account of himself as a Catholic citizen—and not to leave understanding, exposition and, if necessary, militant defense of Catholic thought on public questions entirely to the clergy and Religious.

These are times when it is difficult to separate the false from the true; these are times when it is difficult to answer one's own questions. It is so easy to be confused. I have no intention, even if I had the ability, to try to analyze the condition of the world today. Men who are competent to analyze it have done so for us and set forth their conclusions in no uncertain

terms. I should like to give you brief comments from three of them which seem to me to epitomize the situation so well and give us a course as Catholic laymen.

Father Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., one of the Associate Editors of AMERICA, wrote in its columns several months ago:

For a hundred years now, the spirit of secularism has ruled Western civilization. During this time astounding material progress has been made; yet all the brilliant discoveries of science, and their equally brilliant application to industry, have been powerless to give us either peace or true happiness. After the last war, there appeared to be some hope that men would return to God. The lesson, it was thought, had been so bloody and terrible that even modern fools could learn it. But they did not. Even now, after the warm blood of our youth is being spilled a second time within a generation, they have not learned it. They have not learned that without God there can be no peace.

His Excellency, Archbishop Spellman, says in his inspiring book, *The Road to Victory*:

Not only is the world morally sick; it is mentally unbalanced. How sad it is to think that the world, and especially our own country, has made such progress intellectually, mechanically, industrially and at the same time has retrogressed morally and spiritually. It seems as if we are watching the downfall of civilization. When we add to this our domestic problems of social, industrial and racial unrest, it is no wonder that many hearts are sad as they look to the future.

In those two statements, you have the simple truth as to where we are as these men see it. Now let me give you the viewpoint of a distinguished and learned layman.

Thomas F. Woodlock has written a remarkable book called *The Catholic Pattern*. In it he shows us how the Church gives us a complete pattern of life. As to the world today, he says that the present disorder in the world results from three great apostasies or aberrations of thinking (at the top): an apostasy from religion; an apostasy from philosophy; and an apostasy from morals. He points out that it is the denial of the moral law rather than the breach of it that is so alarming for Catholics. And he adds that it is in the field of public, as distinguished from private morality, that the apostasy from morals is more clearly apparent as a true cause of the world's present agony. My thesis this morning, if I have one, relates to this idea.

COURAGEOUS ACTION NEEDED

Now it is in this field—of public morality—that we are most likely to be bewildered. And it is in this field that the best opportunities arise for Catholic laymen to make their influence felt. It is in this field where courageous action is most necessary and would be most potent; yet it is here that the tendency of the layman is to avoid the challenge and to let the issue pass. We are afraid, as the saying goes, "to stick our neck out." We hesitate to question, publicly I mean, the thing that we know privately and by Catholic standards is unsound and dangerous.

Perhaps I am so interested in this idea because my professional interest is partly, at least, in the techniques by

which people are influenced to act or not to act with reference to political, economic and social issues, as well as with reference to products and services of one kind or another. And the herd instinct, the tendency to accept what seems to be accepted by the crowd, is strong in all of us.

As the World War progresses and its impact is felt more definitely day by day, the realization comes to every thinking man that the present debacle results from the fact that Fascism, Communism, Nazism, and unfortunately to a large extent, secular Americanism are based on a thoroughly pagan principle that there is no such thing as an absolute right or wrong, and acts are justified solely by their expediency. The war has thrown this reasoning into sharp focus. We hear secular college professors—and what a vogue they have had these many years—saying glibly that there are no such things as inherent rights of man, that every right emanates from society.

The job we have is to keep our thinking straight when all around us we see what we have been taught to regard as fundamental rules of conduct utterly ignored, if not denied, or so distorted that they seem to sanction their own violation. These things are difficult to deal with because they are made to seem so plausible. For example: We find the expedient thing to do is disguised as the right thing to do. What is currently conventional becomes *ipso facto* what is moral.

Insincerity, if not outright deception, is passed off for truth if it is more convenient. Bad faith is not held to be immoral if you express it in the right semantics. Declared purposes have nothing to do with actual purposes except to conceal them.

HAVE TWO RESPONSIBILITIES

Human nature being what it is, there is nothing new in these phenomena. What we have been witnessing, however, is their exploitation, not only on a national and international scale, but on such a bold and arrogant basis as to make hypocrisy seem almost virtuous. As Catholic laymen we should not be deceived. We should not be blown from our moorings. I think we have two responsibilities: One is to recognize these things for what they are; the other is to use our influence to expose them, or at least to speak out against them whenever occasions arise for us to do so, and not by our silence give acquiescence to them. Tolerance, about which we have been hearing so much, does not require us to be tolerant of ideas that are repugnant to the truth. Nor do we gain in self respect or the respect of our neighbors or our business and social contacts if our so-called tolerance is of that order. No doubt in your discussion groups you are considering these phases of current affairs and devising ways in which, as Catholic laymen, you can be both informed and articulate about them from the Catholic point of view.

There is danger, I think, in the belief that the war itself, insofar as it is bringing about a return to religion, is doing the job for us and that therefore we do not need to worry very much about this apostasy from morality to which Mr. Woodlock refers. There is evidence that people are thinking more about spiritual things and perhaps praying more than they ever did before, but there is also abundant evidence that this does not mean that bigotry, irreligion and various forms of anti-Catholicism are taking a holiday. Revival of interest in God seems to have stirred them to new life.

Take as an indication the article entitled "The Catholic Issue" in the March 1st number of the *New Republic*. For sheer arrogance and the divide-and-destroy technique, it is a masterpiece. But as also posing some of the kinds of things on which Catholic laymen must be courageously articulate, it is very significant. The author deals with what he calls the "reactionary Catholic aggression" of the Church. He goes on to say that opponents of Catholicism must be ready to take on in rough and tumble political combat those Catholics who, he charges, attempt to coerce newspapers and producers of plays and pictures and public officials.

Now there is an example of present-day semantics in a flagrant form. By the brazen use of bad symbol words, he states his assumptions as

though they were facts that everyone will recognize.

In his syndicated column, George Sokolsky, who is not a Catholic, called this article a shocking diatribe. He remarked that the Catholic Church needs no defense by him and added: "It has survived for nearly 2,000 years because it represents a disciplined morality based upon the laws of God."

CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

You can readily see, however, that if this is the party line of the so-called intelligentsia in this country, Catholic laymen have their work cut out for them. Why? Because this article represents, as I see it, the kind of plausible argument we meet in our relations with people who do not have the Catholic point of view. Its significance for what I am trying to say to you is two-fold: First, it indicates the type of ideas that challenge us as Catholic laymen, and second, it indicates how cleverly those ideas are sugar-coated to deceive the unwary. "Censorship," "Thwarting social workers," "Preventing public policy," "Coercing the Press"—all bad symbols, as the psychologists say. What we have to do is to cut through these semantics; recognize these ideas for what they are, and have no patience with them.

We need make no apology for our stand in those fields in which public morality is concerned. For public morality is a fundamental of our American government. Mr. Woodlock points out in his book, to which

I have already referred, what may not occur to us; the preamble to the Declaration of Independence contains a declaration of Catholic principles stated with remarkable exactitude. They affirm God, they affirm the human person, they affirm the sacredness, the dignity, the inviolability of human personality, they affirm the rights that belong to that dignity, they affirm the primary purpose of government as the protection of the person in those rights, they affirm the right of the people to choose for themselves the form of government that they deem best and, when necessary, to change it, and they affirm the natural law. In other words, here is the fundamental principle upon which we as citizens and Catholics can rely.

Now I am not suggesting that we go through life with a chip on our shoulder. I go back to what I said earlier, that in the work of the Regis Alumni Association, you have a pat-

tern of action for Catholic laymen which offers great possibilities. I think it has great possibilities of expansion on the individual level. By that I mean it should encourage the individual to carry his lay apostolate beyond the work of the Association. What the Association is doing should encourage you to join other Catholic organizations and to participate actively in their work. It should help you to give a good account of yourselves as Catholics in your business or professional organizations, in your social and political life. That is not only where Catholic ideas, the Catholic point of view, and the Catholic influence are so often lacking, but also where they can be most effective. And finally, it should give you such increasing confidence as will enable you as Catholic laymen to do your part in this age of the layman. As a good Catholic take an active part in Catholic affairs. As a good citizen take a Catholic part in other affairs.



On Penance

By confession we acknowledge before God that we have sinned. Not, indeed, as though God were ignorant, but so that by confessing our sins reparation may be made ready and repentance may be born, and by repentance God may be softened. Thus even when confession truly humiliates a man, it lifts him up even more; when it reveals his uncleanness, it washes him; when it accuses him, likewise it forgives; and when it condemns him, it also sets him free. For if you are severe with yourself, God is mild towards you.—*Tertullian*.

Peace and Communism

An Editorial Reprinted from the NEW YORK TIMES, April 26, 1943.

IN A book entitled *America, Russia, and the Communist Party in the Postwar World*, written by John L. Childs and George S. Counts for the Commission of Education and the Postwar World of the American Federation of Teachers, the authors write:

It should be clear that the American Communist party is a movement whose leaders do not consider themselves bound by either the principles of American democracy or the standards of ordinary group morality. The American people have been slow to recognize that the conflict with this revolutionary and conspiratorial group is, in the last analysis, a conflict of two moralities. The actual record of the objectives of the American Communist party during the past twenty-five years, however, shows that it has produced consequences exactly as evil as its purposes and methods of behavior would have led one to anticipate. The path of this party is strewn with the wreckage of persons and movements. Experience has demonstrated that it adds not one ounce of strength to any liberal, democratic or humane cause; on the contrary, it weakens, degrades or destroys every cause that it touches.

Although super-liberals who fall on their face at the mention of Russia denounce this book as being in line with "Goebbels's propaganda" and likely to irritate the Kremlin, many American liberals and disillusioned fellow-travelers acclaim it because it advocates a genuine understanding between America and Russia on the basis of "mutual" concessions. One of these concessions is to be the disbandment of the American Communist party as an instrument of Russian policy. No sensible American will dispute the desirability of these objectives. But it may be doubted whether the suggested Russian concession is sufficient. What the authors say of the American Communist party is true of the Communist party in every land. It was true of the Communist party in Italy and in Germany, and it was true of the Communist party in France. The chief effect of the activities of the Communist party outside of Russia has been to pave the way for a Fascist reaction. It helped to bring Mussolini and Hitler to power and to plunge Europe into war; it helped to weaken the Spanish Republic; it helped to split France to its defeat; it is still the most important factor that ties Hitler's satellites to his banner.

A genuine understanding among Russia, America and Great Britain is essential for the future peace of the world. But such an understanding will remain less than genuine as long as the Communist party under the direction of the Kremlin is active in other

lands in a "conflict of two moralities" and helps to precipitate an inevitable counter-revolution. Nobody in his senses will court a conflict with Russia, but on the contrary will gladly welcome her into the family of nations as long as she confines her Bolshevik system to her own borders. But if Russia uses Communist Trojan horses either as agents of world revolution or as shock troops of a Bolshevik imperialism, neither peace nor the Four Freedoms will remain secure anywhere. The danger is not the Bolshevik bogey raised by Goebbels, but rather the Fascist reaction that feeds on it. The way to achieve an understanding is neither the hush-hush policy advocated by some nor the moral and intellectual surrender urged by others, but a bold and frank discussion of the problems in the manner practiced by the Moscow realists themselves.



A Religious Mind

A religious mind is ever marvelling, and irreligious men laugh and scoff at it because it marvels. A religious mind is ever looking out of itself, is ever pondering God's words, is ever "looking into" them with the angels, is ever realizing to itself Him on whom it depends, and who is the center of all truth and good. Carnal and proud minds are contented with self; they like to remain at home; when they hear of mysteries, they have no devout curiosity to go and see the great sight, though it be ever so little out of their way; and when it actually falls in their path, they stumble at it. As great then as is the difference between hanging upon the thought of God and resting in ourselves, lifting up the heart to God and bringing all things in heaven and earth down to ourselves, exalting God and exalting reason, measuring things by God's power and measuring them by our own ignorance, so great is the difference between him who believes in the Christian mysteries and him who does not. And were there no other reason for the revelation of them but this gracious one, of raising us, refining us, making us reverent, making us expectant and devout, surely this would be more than a sufficient one.—
Cardinal Newman.

Mission to the Jews

STANLEY B. JAMES

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC HERALD, London, January 29, 1943

THE APOSTOLATE for the Christianization of the modern world is a phrase which may sound magnificent, but without further definition, is apt to lose itself in vagueness. In spiritual as well as in military warfare something in the nature of strategy is essential. One must try to seize key positions. Before battle is joined decisively there is a period when the contending forces manoeuvre for position. Divinely guided, the apostolate of the first century had a goal. St. Peter and St. Paul converged on Rome, the center of the world. If Rome was won, the rest of the Empire in due course would follow.

WORLD OF TOMORROW

The conclusion of the war will tell us who is to govern the world of tomorrow. We believe that it will be the United Nations, and that in this alliance the English-speaking peoples will take a leading share. Our strategy, therefore, must have some relation to that fact. Attention must be concentrated on the Christianization of the British Commonwealth and the United States. If we seem to be somewhat preoccupied with the task this sets us, it is not merely because it is to this federation of peoples we ourselves belong. We can justify our preference on the

objective probability that the religion of the English-speaking peoples is going to mean a great deal to the rest of mankind. But even this limitation of our immediate object leaves the matter somewhat nebulous. Not merely the geographical distribution of these people but the variety of types found within them is bewildering. Can we say more particularly what we mean by the Modern Man as found in the communities indicated?

Perhaps that question is best answered by asking another question: What are we fighting about? We can set on one side the facile replies which serve better to glorify our cause than to state the case realistically. But there is one thing which ever more clearly distinguishes us from our enemy and supplies a bond of union between ourselves. The discovery of what that thing is may be somewhat disturbing, but the revelation ought not, for that reason, to be denied. Nor ought its seeming remoteness from the struggle and its historical origins to render the conclusion unacceptable.

It is indisputable that we have been given a horrifying realization at least of what it is that we are fighting against. Hitler's cold-blooded efforts to exterminate by the cruellest methods an insane sadism can devise the whole

Jewish Community within the occupied territories has, more than anything else he has done, cast a lurid light on his sinister figure. Anyone reading Victor Gollancz's pamphlet, *Let My People Go*, will get a glimpse into Hell such as history, happily, rarely provides. That glimpse does really seem to give us an understanding of the evil we are combating. And the profound hatred of anti-Semitism which it has provoked finds other forms of expression. One of the tests used to determine the attitude of the French Imperial Council in Algiers is as to whether it will repeal the anti-Semitic laws previously operative in the Colony. Their respective attitude towards the Jew is coming to be a crucial test, the reaction to which determines on which side the nation stands. It is not suggested that our conscious aims are thereby defined. Probe deep enough, however, and it will be found that the suggestion is not far from the truth.

THE MODERN MAN

The reason for this championship of the Jew is not sheer humanitarianism. If that had been the motive, we should not have allowed the *Struma* with its 769 Jewish passengers to seek vainly for some hospitable port. Nor should we now be virtually forbidding Hitler's Jewish victims to find a refuge among us. No, it is something other than humanitarianism that makes us the Jew's champion, something more even than the fact that the suf-

ferings he has borne are useful propaganda in stirring up hatred of the enemy.

The fact is that the Jew, as we know him in our great urbanized centers, in a curious and even in a mysterious way, symbolizes and embodies that modernity which feels itself threatened by "Fascist" reaction. This is especially evident in the exclusive interest both of the Jews as such and of our generation in this world. That characteristic runs through the Old Testament no less than through modern literature. It may be exhibited as a noble ethicalism deeply conscious of its obligations here and now, or it may be displayed in a gross practical materialism; but whether we consider the Jewish outlook or that characteristic of the type commonest in our civilization, we find the same exclusive concern with the present order.

It is also true that the Jew, through the effect of the prosecution to which he has been subjected, has developed an urban mentality in complete harmony with the standpoint of the city-bred modern crowd. If the chief interest of the Jew (through the same circumstances as those just mentioned) is commercial, so is that of the people whom Napoleon called a nation of shop-keepers and their Transatlantic allies. So obvious is it that there is scarcely need to mention the rootlessness which is common to both and which distinguishes them so strikingly from the peoples of an older time. Those who are exiles under century-

old compulsion and those whom the Industrial Revolution deprived of their rural birthright and in whom easy modes of transport have accentuated the desire to travel are now kindred nomads. These are but a few points of contact, but they might be multiplied.

And this particular Jewish type is found in all classes and in conjunction with the most violently opposed tastes. It is sheer folly in anti-Semites to talk of a Jewish conspiracy. The differences within Jewry are far too great for that. It is to be identified exclusively neither with plutocracy nor with Communism. It is Liberal and it is Conservative. It displays artistic genius and it is pre-eminent in science. Within the limits defined there is a wide catholicity. In fact, between this widely scattered and yet racially-united community and that of Catholicism there is a striking parallel. The one natural, the other supernatural exhibit a strong likeness to each other.

EXILES

The task before us is now sufficiently clear. Whether it is correct to speak of the present age as apocalyptic we cannot say. But in one respect at least we may regard it as revolutionary. The course of the apostolate of the Primitive Church, it would seem, has to be reversed. Then it was a mission to the nations. Now, it is a mission to Israel conducted by "the sons of adoption."

That mission has one plain line

of approach. The deepest, most poignant need, eloquent in all Israel's history for the last nineteen hundred years, is that of a Home in which the wanderers may rest, not an improvised home, not a home to which by cruel circumstances they are forced to adapt themselves but one in which, prompted by truly native surroundings, the songs of Zion will spring spontaneously to the lips.

That applies not only to Israel but, as we have seen, to the vast mass of those in the modern world with whom he is associated. It is a commonplace of the criticism directed against present-day tendencies that they are destroying domestic life and making the old privacy and stability impossible. There seems little hope that those tendencies will become weaker. We are, in every sense of the phrase, an uprooted generation, restless, dissatisfied, frustrated, yet without quite understanding why.

But we are not to regard this condition as an unmitigated evil. It was during its exile in Babylon that the prophets of Israel acquired that more spiritual conception of Jerusalem which was to pave the way for Christianity. To find a Home in which the spirit may rest in peace and charity is more important even than to sit by one's own hearth in one's native land. And it was by the loss of the latter that the more enlightened of the Chosen People learned the meaning and value of the former. Is it a wild conjecture that the homelessness of the

modern world has, in the wisdom of Providence, a very similar lesson to teach?

If that conjecture be right, we can see a meaning in those monotonous streets of our cities and suburbs composed of houses which are not homes. Threading through the gloom and mystery of the world we have made for ourselves runs the bright thread of a Divine Design intended to lead us back to that Abode to which we belong and in which alone we can find rest. Even the stark ruins of bombed dwellings are not, in this connection, without their significance. Detachment from the material and the earthly must condition the discovery of the spiritual and the real.

That defines for us the way of approach to the Jew and to the Modern Man whom he, in so many ways, represents. The presentation of Christ-

ianity as a European product of comparatively recent origin is not only untrue to the facts but has made impossible the reconciliation of Israel. It is the function of the Church to give back to Israel the God Whom so many of them have lost and to restore to them that tradition, deepened and enriched by its fulfilment in the Messiah in which, even though continuing, as far as the body is concerned, an exile existence, their spirits may find peace. And, in doing that, in reviving the continuity with the past which was so vivid a thing for the first generation of Christians, we shall be presenting our religion in a form that will appeal also to our generation. The forward movement of the apostolate in the modern world is conditioned by a backward movement to our historical origins and antecedents.



Once in All

Thanks to the bond of mutual charity, the Church of Christ possesses such strong cohesion that it is one in the plurality of its members, and at the same time mysteriously entire in each. And it is quite correct to say that at the same time that the universal Church is presented as the only spouse of Christ, it is an object of faith that each soul is, in a certain sense, by the mystery of the sacrament, the Church in its fulness.—*St. Peter Damien.*

Humanism and Peace

GERALD G. WALSH, S.J.

Reprinted from THOUGHT, March, 1943

IN NORMAL times distinctions between broad and Catholic humanism, between ultimate and proximate aims, between man's immortal destiny and his mortal culture might seem to many to be of merely academic interest. But as things now are, in a global combat to decide, perhaps for generations to come, the character of our mortal culture, those distinctions become the very core of the world crisis. That is to say, they become the central point about which the whole world must make what the Greeks called a *krisis*, and what we call a judgment, a decision.

This much can be said at once. Humanism of a sort, a rather vaguely understood humanism, has already become the one real bond genuinely uniting the peoples of the Allied Nations. Humanism in this sense means very little more than the idea that each human person has a right to his own happiness and a duty of respecting the dignity of others. To make a world safe for humanism, to make a world in which those who deny that right and disregard that duty shall have no power to impose their will on others, has become the one war aim that seems worthy enough to carry the United Nations to final victory.

But, of course, the more positive

question in every thinking mind is this: What shall we do with the Victory when it comes? Merely to make a world safe for culture is not the same as to be in possession of culture itself. Nor, on the other hand, is every kind of culture safe for the world. There was no lack of culture in 1939. But it is now obvious that the predominant culture of several countries in that year was a culture that was unsafe for the world, a culture that made a world conflict inevitable.

Be this as it may, while our soldiers and statesmen are working to win the war, to take the arms from the hands of the enemies of genuinely human culture, educators are expected to be working to win the peace, to be devising some positive program of culture that will be both theoretically sound and practically acceptable to all men of good will.

The statesmen who will gather around the table at the peace conference are not likely to adopt as a plank of world reconstruction the "ultimate aim" of "Catholic humanism," that is to say, the "fulfilment of the individual's final destiny."¹ But there are two propositions which contemporary statesmen seem increasingly inclined to accept. The first is this, that

¹Cf. Redden and Ryan, *The Catholic Philosophy of Education*, p. 62.

whenever culture has been controlled by those who deny the idea of final destiny culture has tended to become less and less human. That, in fact, is the epitaph which history is already writing on the tomb of the die-hard Liberal culture which, after two confused centuries and two ghastly wars, has been, at least temporarily, put in the grave. The real malice of the "Liberal" culture was the heresy that man becomes more free, and therefore more human, the more he is freed from God, that is to say, the more he is deprived of supernatural Grace and the more he thinks himself superior to the demands of conscience.

HUMAN VALUES

The second proposition which men of affairs seem more and more inclined to admit is that the purely human values of scientific truth, political peace and artistic creation have, somehow or other, been most safe when men have believed there is an Absolute Truth higher than science, a Perfect Peace beyond the reach of politics and a Supreme Beauty that transcends what we can see in stones or hear in song or feel in music. In a word, the world seems increasingly aware of the need for the Church in the postwar world.

Nevertheless, what the world will most want to learn from the Church will be not so much dogmatic details about man's hope of Beatitude in Heaven as the practical prospects of his happiness on earth.

And here precisely is the responsibility of Catholic humanism.

Humanism is more than an "educational aim"; and, of course, still more than a matter of educational method. Humanism stands for very much more than the idea that the best way to get an education is to learn Latin and Greek. It is true that most of the "humanists" of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did learn Latin and Greek and did, in fact, think that was the best method of getting an education. But their "humanism" was not in their Latin and Greek. Their humanism was in their theory and pursuit of human happiness, of nobility, virtue and dignity, of purpose in life. Anyone who will take the trouble to read a dozen or so of the works of Renaissance humanists, dealing with human happiness, the dignity of man, and the purpose of human living, will find nothing particularly "modern" in such works. Almost to a man the humanists of those days accepted either the Epicurean, or the Aristotelian, or the Stoic, or the Neoplatonist, or the Augustinian, or the Thomistic philosophy of happiness; or, at any rate, some confusion of one of these views or some combination of several of them.

Humanism is the idea that a human being is meant by nature to pursue and achieve in a human way a fair measure of temporal happiness; that human life gets its human dignity from this pursuit and its human value from this achievement. Humanists

commonly speak of pursuing truth, goodness and beauty. But I think it is more immediately understandable if we say that humanism is the idea that a human being is meant to achieve happiness by the proper use of his intelligence, his conscience and his taste. The idea is that if a person will develop the power of his intelligence to distinguish what is true from what is false, his conscience to distinguish what is right from what is wrong, his taste to distinguish what is fair from what is foul, he has the best chance in the world of becoming humanly happy.

CHRISTIAN HUMANISM

Humanism belongs not merely to education, but to life; and in this sense, it is, of course, much older than the 15th century Renaissance. It may even be said that the 15th century was rather the end than the beginning of humanism. It was the end, at least, of the integral humanism that had distinguished the best men of medieval Christendom; and the beginning of that sectarian humanism which has been the mark of the modern world. Modern humanism has been either too exclusively aesthetic, as in the 15th century; or too purely intellectualistic, as in the 18th century "Enlightenment"; or too purely ethical, as in the 20th century system developed by Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer More. Even in the great period of the Catholic Reformation there was something too prudish and pedagogical

about the humanism then in vogue; in the 17th century there was something too formal and classical; in the early 19th, something too sentimental and romantic.

The moment we try to be specialists in humanism we cease to be humanists. There cannot be one humanism for the artists, another for the philosophers and a third for the saints. In the Christian millennium from the 4th to the 14th century there was a practically unbroken chain of humanists who at the same time could feel and sing like artists, think and write like sages, live and pray like saints. The supreme example is, of course, the great St. Augustine. When he is at his best it is almost impossible to know which to admire most, his artistic sensitivity to the beauty of style, or his philosophical penetration of the truth, or his religious communion with God. He has often enough been quoted as though he esteemed religion above ethics and ethics above a liberal education. And so, indeed, he did—as everyone must who has any real love for a liberal education. But it is well to remember that in his *De Ordine* (ii, 26) he could write: "A young person who neglects the liberal arts may be both pious and pure; but so long as he has to live a man among men, I do not see how anyone can call him happy." In such a phrase you have the very core of the tradition of Christian humanism.

In place of "happiness," Christian humanists will often speak of "peace."

St. Augustine, for instance, was fond of picturing to himself a possible world wholly at peace because filled with men at peace with themselves. He meant men who had so disciplined their intelligence, their conscience and their taste that every passion of their sensitive nature was in harmony with the judgment of their reason, while this in turn was obedient to whatever higher light or law God has revealed. At a time when we are all wondering about the prospects of world peace after the war, it is well to recall the formula for world order proposed by this Catholic humanist. Writing on the seventh Beatitude of the Sermon on the Mount, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God," St. Augustine says:

Those who are at peace with themselves, with their passions in order, subject to reason, mind, spirit, and their carnal concupiscences put into harness, make up the Kingdom of God. This Reign of God means that all things are in order, that what in man is highest (and in the best sense human) is given control, and whatever we have in common with beasts is made to obey; while, at the same time, man's most human excellence, his mind and reason, is subject to a more powerful sway, to the very Truth incarnate, to the Only-begotten Son of God. *For man will not control what is below him unless he obey what is above him.* And this is the peace which is possible on earth for men of good will; this is the life of the man of supreme and perfect wisdom. (*De sermone Domini in monte*, I, xi, PL. xxxiv, 1245.)

At the end of the Christian millennium another Catholic humanist, Dante Alighieri, put the Christian formula for world order in the im-

mortal line: "In His Will is our peace" (*Paradiso*, iii, 85). Dante was, in fact, thinking of immortal and supernatural Peace when he wrote that line; but, as with all Catholic humanists, the mortal and immortal, the natural and the supernatural, reason and Revelation, were not thought of as separated in fact, but only as distinguishable by the mind. It is in this sense that Dante in the *Monarchia* speaks of man as having a twofold end.

An inscrutable Providence [he writes] has proposed to man two purposes to pursue. One is happiness in this life, which can be achieved by the operations of man's natural powers. The other is the Beatitude of Eternal Life, which consists in the Blessedness of the Vision of God and which no natural power can reach unless helped by the Light of God. These two happinesses must be reached by different roads. We come to the first in the light of philosophy and by means of the moral and intellectual virtues. We come to the second in the light of Revelation transcending human reason, provided we co-operate by means of acts of the theological virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity. Unfortunately, human passion, like an untamed horse without bit and bridle, keeps wandering from the road; and therefore men need the double directives of the Church and the State. They need a supreme spiritual Authority to guide them to Eternal Life along the road of Revelation; and they need political Authority, acting according to reason, to direct them to happiness on earth. It might be possible, without such Authorities, for a few—a very few, and these only with very great difficulty—to attain to double happiness; but the only condition on which most men can be happy is that they should enjoy freedom in the undisturbed tranquillity of peace. And this in fact is the purpose of law, namely, that in this arena of mortal life men may be free and in peace . . . remembering always, of course, that mortal felicity is itself a means to that which is immortal (*Monarchia*, III, xvi, 7-18).

"That in this arena of mortal life, men may be free and in peace, *ut in areola ista mortalium libere cum pace vivatur.*" I do not know that anyone has ever expressed with more beauty and wisdom man's supreme natural aspiration. But Dante did not forget to add: "... remembering always that mortal felicity is itself a means to that which is immortal, *cum mortalis ista felicitas quodammodo ad immortalem felicitatem ordinetur.*" If one makes the obvious remark that in writing Latin like this Dante was a punctilious observer of the rhetorical rules that governed the rhythm of musical prose, it becomes even clearer that when Catholic humanism was in the saddle there was no lack of enthusiasm either for political peace or for cultural values.

CATHOLIC HUMANISM'S RIGHT

It is for this reason that Catholic humanism has a right to be heard at any future Peace conference whose function will be to sow once more the seeds of culture in the fields that have been harrowed by war. The Liberals who laughed at ultimate aims and final destiny as the enemies of human happiness will no doubt go on laughing. They will have learned nothing—and forgotten everything. But at least the soldiers and statesmen will be looking for the right sort of intellectual and moral leadership.

Under these circumstances, it seems important for Catholic educators to remember that Christian humanists may be called upon today to fight any

or all of the battles which Christian humanism has had to fight from the beginning. Those battles have been four—with Paganism, with Barbarism, with Puritanism and with Positivism.

It took the first four centuries of the Christian era to prove that without Revelation neither the Pagan Greek passion for logic and truth nor the Pagan Roman genius for law and order could provide mankind with a satisfying culture or a stable civilization. It took the next four centuries to prove to the Barbarians that human vigor without Divine Grace is not enough. It took four centuries more to prove to the new Christians that monastic piety and purity were not, by themselves and as far as human happiness goes, an adequate substitute for Greek philosophy, Roman law, Teuton feeling and Celtic charm. Only in the 12th and 13th centuries were Christian humanists given the reins. The result was Christendom in the fullest sense—a world in which passion for learning filled the universities of Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Naples, Valencia and dozens and dozens more; in which passion for law made Justinian and Gratian household names from Scotland to Sicily and from Portugal to Poland; in which passion for poetry produced the *Chanson de Roland*, the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Divine Comedy*, and thousands of lesser things; in which passion for beauty filled Europe with such things as the façade of Notre Dame, the blue windows of Chartres, and the *beau*

dieu of Amiens. The Christian humanists gave us a world in which there was love in millions of homes, learning in thousands of schools, law in hundreds of kingdoms and lesser states, and supernatural living everywhere.

Then came the fourth battle of Christian humanism—the battle with Positivism. With Catholic Nominalists in the 14th century, the enemy took the form of what looked like scientific and philosophical progress. Two centuries later, with the Reformers, it took the form of religious emancipation. Two centuries after this, with the French *philosophes*, it took the form of a so-called intellectual enlightenment. And two centuries later, in our own day, it has taken its final, logical, blatant form of materialistic positivism.

THE REMEDY

The remedy is a return to our roots. Those roots are to be found in that *magna carta* of Christian humanism which appears in the account which St. Luke has left of the education of Jesus Christ. That education, we are told, consisted in docility to authority flowering in progress in the triple life of wisdom, of manhood and of Divine Grace, in what the Greek original calls *sophia*, *helikia* and *charis*. *Sophia*, wisdom, speculative thought is what set the Hellenic intelligence on fire. *Helikia*, *virtus*, practical human righteousness, is what the Roman conscience strove to make perfect. *Charis*, Grace, is the lovely and gratuitous

favor which only God can give. The main point in that *magna carta* is that when the Incarnation brought *Charis* back to the world it did not take away *Sophia* and *Helikia*. In one of her noblest hymns the Church sings that God who gives immortal crowns does not snatch away our mortal joys, *non eripit mortalia qui regna dat caelestia*.

Catholic humanism is, then, true "positivism," as Liberalism has proved itself to be, in fact, pure "negativism." Catholic humanism, whose ultimate preoccupation is with the Mysteries of Grace and Glory, has a proximate, but no less passionate preoccupation with the natural values of truth, beauty and goodness; with the human perfection of our intelligence, our conscience and our taste; and with still more warmly human things like economic prosperity, political order, family affection and personal freedom. Catholic humanism aims at human happiness; but it knows that the many roads to peace will only meet when reason is helped by Revelation in the search for truth, conscience with Divine counsels and commandments in the search for justice, and taste with supernatural Grace in the pursuit of beauty.

If there is any saner and more tested practical wisdom than this, by all means let it be told to the statesmen who are to meet and make a new world of peace and culture. If there is not, Catholic humanism should be given a hearing.

Fascism and the Corporate State

Reprinted from THE WEEKLY REVIEW, London, March 11, 1943.

THE practice is growing in our Press to confuse, wittingly or unwittingly, the Corporate State with Fascism.

This confusion, besides being misleading, is apt to be dangerous because the term Fascism is almost everywhere loosely used to comprise all forms of the Totalitarian State, or, indeed, almost any type of government against which a particular writer feels rancor. Thus, the odium attaching to this interpretation of Fascism is directed quite unjustly to the method of representation that bears the name corporatism.

The latter term—as it should be unnecessary to explain—has nothing whatever to do with Totalitarianism, that is, the theory that individual citizens are in everything subordinate to an all-powerful State; it merely means that men and women are grouped politically by the different kinds of work they do, instead of in regional constituencies. As a political theory it is thus on the same footing as all other political theories—whether monarchic, oligarchic, or democratic—and can be perfectly well made to subserve any one of these three forms of government.

It is true that Fascist Italy was the first modern State to work out a detailed system of trade corporations and syndicates and to institute a corporative council as the supreme repre-

sentative body of the nation under the Grand Fascist Council; but there is nothing Fascist, in the sense of Totalitarian, in this body: it is certainly as democratic as a parliament, and there are many good reasons for thinking it more useful as well as more representative of the people.

ITALIAN CORPORATISM

In another sense Italian corporatism is, of course, a constituent part of the Fascist régime, for it was Signor Mussolini and his advisers who inaugurated it and worked it into the new system; but Fascism has never been comprehensively defined. Mussolini's article on the subject in the Italian encyclopaedia pronounces it to be Totalitarian, but clearly that characteristic is in no way produced by its system of corporations; however true it may be to say that the Italian Corporations are affected by the Totalitarian poison.

In this war we are fighting primarily against a State that had shown by a series of unjustifiable aggressions that no nation could call its soul its own until that State had been subdued. In so far as we are fighting against a system of government, that system is the one called Totalitarian which would bring under State domination even the spiritual life and consciences of its subjects. We have as

our oldest ally a nation whose hatred for Totalitarianism is nowhere surpassed, but yet whose system of government is based upon corporate principles.

From these elementary facts it will be evident that any confusion of Corporatism with Totalitarianism shows deplorable ignorance. But it is an ignorance, as we have said, which presents grave perils.

A FALSE IMPRESSION

The Observer, for instance, in its issue of last Sunday contains an article by "Liberator" in which it is implied that because "General Giraud has informed his new Economic Council that he is a fervent believer in the Corporate State," he is therefore unfit to direct the civil administration of North Africa. That this, or something even more insulting to General Giraud, is the writer's implication is made pretty clear by the previous paragraph, where he is discussing the civil administrations that we shall find in the various countries of Europe when we invade. After telling his readers that we shall find Nazi Quisling administrations carrying on in those countries, he goes on: "What are we to do? Are we going to follow the North African example and leave these people (i.e. Quislings) in office on the ground that we do not seek to interfere in their domestic affairs . . . or are we to instal the London Emigré Governments?"

It is astounding to find a regular contributor to a responsible paper prepared to make such a wholly false com-

parison. What earthly connection is there between a distinguished soldier who has taken great risks to join whole-heartedly with us in driving the Germans out of his country, and the wretched traitor Quisling and his like? The suggestion is as preposterous as it is insulting, and apparently the only grounds upon which it is based is that General Giraud is a believer in the Corporate State.

We mention this example from *The Observer* partly because it shows to what lengths this strange confusion of two things utterly different in kind can go; and partly because *The Observer* has deservedly won a reputation in the past for sound comment upon, and criticism of, events. But it is only one instance among hundreds that could be cited from the Press and public speeches.

This strange mental aberration is difficult to understand; for the virulence of its expression and its willingness to court dangerous international repercussions can hardly be explained by a dislike for functional as opposed to regional representation. Whatever arguments may be adduced for or against either of these two political forms, there is no moral principle involved: both are, in that sense, neutral.

One can only suppose either that the interests vested in parliamentarianism are so strong as to cause those holding them to fight desperately for their retention; or else that mere words and the association of words have

taken the place in men's minds of the things they represent.

If the latter explanation is true we are putting ourselves at the mercy of

every cunning charlatan that comes along, and are stirring up trouble that it will be difficult to allay. Signs of this are already apparent.



Cardinal Hinsley

In his high dignity he showed himself a doughty fighter, never compromising with man where he believed that the cause of God was in issue, and contending vigorously for all the interests of his own Church. He shared the revulsion of his countrymen against the horrors of revived paganism on the Continent; he could give more profound reasons for that revulsion than most of them; and the outbreak of war made him immediately a national voice. To Cardinal Hinsley the warfare against worship of the State and racial fanaticism was the holy war against the powers of darkness; and, summoning his own flock to dedicate themselves to the crusade as a religious duty, he found that the call was heard by multitudes outside his own Church. The movement of the Sword of the Spirit, which the Cardinal founded, became a rallying point at which Christians of many denominations found it possible to fight a concerted battle by basing themselves upon the universal moral law. Without in any way abating his belief in the significance of those differences of doctrine and observance by which his Church is divided from other denominations, he held strongly that there is a righteousness that can be perceived by all who bear the name of Christians, and through his steadfastness and loyalty to all who would extend a hand to him as a fellow-soldier for that cause, he leaves a happier relation between his communion and the national Church than has been known since the Reformation.—LONDON TIMES, *March 18, 1943.*

Negroes and Labor Unions

Whereas many labor unions are excluding qualified Negro workers from membership in violation of the principles for which unions are established;

Therefore we call upon every labor organization and each and every local to render complete and equal justice to Negro workers both in the interest of the war effort and to insure the efficacy, inclusiveness and unity of labor.

We believe that the following points are self evident:

1. Labor is today subjected to criticism because of many of its organizational policies and instances of undemocratic control.

2. There is no justification for the all too prevalent policy of excluding qualified Negro workers from membership in certain unions. The right to work is fundamental, and the right of labor to organize for the protection of *all* workers is one of the basic rights of democracy.

3. It is particularly incumbent upon all Catholic labor leaders to be mindful of Catholic social principles as defined and enjoined by the great Papal Encyclicals which insist upon the observance of the right to work, the right to a living wage—a family living wage—and the right of labor to organize for the well-being and security of all.

4. It is the duty and responsibility of all Catholic labor leaders to make every effort to remove existing barriers to the admission of Negro workers.

5. Certainly no union can deny the rights and the security of union membership to any group because of race, creed or color without impeding the war effort and violating the very principles for which labor unions were primarily established.—*Resolution adopted by the Catholic Interracial Council, February 21, 1943.*

Pope's Affection for Negroes

We confess that we feel a special paternal affection, which is certainly inspired of Heaven, for the Negro people dwelling among you; for in the field of religion and education We know that they need special care and comfort and are very deserving of it. We therefore invoke an abundance of heavenly blessing and We pray fruitful success for those whose generous zeal is devoted to their welfare.—Pius XII in the Encyclical *Sertum Laetitiae*.

SOME THINGS OLD AND NEW

MARY—MOTHER OF GOD

If, as the Catholic Church teaches, and as most non-Catholics believe, Jesus Christ is God from all eternity, why can Mary be called Mother of God?

The answer is simple. Jesus Christ, born of the Ever Blessed Virgin Mary, was God; therefore Mary was His Mother, and it follows that Mary was the Mother of God. And that because her Divine Son was both God and man.

Thus she was His Mother in His human nature. And that she is the Mother of God is a dogma of the Faith, which the Christian Church has accepted from the very beginning of Apostolic times, and it was defined as an article of the Faith by the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in A. D. 431.

But whilst Mary is declared by the Church to be the Mother of God, do not get the matter confused. Mary is not the Mother of His Godhead. For as God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity existed from all eternity. And as Mary was a finite creature, who was born according to human nature, it is obvious that she could not have been the Mother of the Infinite Godhead of her Divine Son.

This has given rise to a misunderstanding of the Mystery of the

Holy Incarnation. It belongs to the ancient heresy of Nestorius (who borrowed it from someone else), which taught that in Christ there were two Persons, the one Divine, the other human; that Jesus Christ was merely the vehicle, so to speak, of the Incarnate Word.

Now this is contrary to the Catholic Faith. For we are obliged by that Faith to believe that in Christ Jesus there were two natures, the one Divine, the other human; but One Person. And that One Person was the Son of Mary, Mother of God.

HIERONYMITE ORDER

Who or what are the Hieronymites? Is this some ancient Order, or is it an entirely new foundation?

The Order of the Hieronymites or, as we would say, the Jeronimists, is a very ancient Religious Order that was revived in Spain in 1941, after a suppression of many years.

Fifteen young men took the vows in the ancient monastery of El Parral, which is in the Province of Segovia. This monastery was founded by King Henry IV, the father of Isabella, Queen of Castille.

The Order of the Hieronymites was under the protection of the kings of Spain, and was favored by such

great monarchs as the Emperor Charles V and his son Philip II. When the Emperor Charles abdicated in 1555, he retired and spent the rest of his days in the monastery of Saint Jerome of Yuste, which belonged to this Order. Philip II entrusted to the Hieronymites the monastery of St. Laurence in the Escorial, where is located the burial place of the kings of Spain.

In 1415 the Hieronymites had twenty-five monasteries in Spain, including the Monastery of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Estramadura, which was visited by the conquistadores and Viceroy of America, and the Real de Madrid, the chapel royal where the Spanish sovereigns were married.

During the centuries the religious houses of the Hieronymites were sacked by different conflicting parties. When the French invaded Spain, they despoiled the Hieronymite monasteries and stole the church treasures and left the monks in dire poverty. Under Carlos III most of their property and buildings had been seized.

At different times attempts were made to revive the Order, one as late as 1927. Many priests entered the Order, but political conditions in Spain seemed to work against the revival of this ancient and noble Spanish Order. But one of the original Hieronymite Fathers survived the recent civil war, and it was he who received into the Order the young men who recently made their vows at the hands of the Apostolic Nuncio to Spain. So that the

continuity of the Order has been preserved.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

How can you tell when the Pope makes an infallible statement? Does he just make up his mind whether he is speaking infallibly or not, or is there some process by which the Pope knows he makes an infallible statement or not?

It is not quite so easy of explanation as that, which probably is the reason why so many well intentioned but quite misinformed persons seem to confuse Papal Infallibility with Inspiration.

Summed up briefly, the teaching on Papal Infallibility is this: That when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when he exercises his office as shepherd and teacher of all Christians (*all Christians, mind you*) he defines by virtue of his apostolic authority a doctrine regarding Faith and Morals to be held by the whole Church, by the Divine assistance promised him in Peter his predecessor, he possesses that infallibility which Christ promised to His Church.

Now there are three things that must be taken into consideration: 1. The authority that was committed to Peter; 2. The question must be of Faith and/or Morals; 3. It must be addressed to the Church Universal.

This does not mean that the Pope some morning decides that he is going to make an infallible pronouncement. Nor, on the other hand, does it imply

that the Pope can dispense with study and learning.

But it does mean that he cannot use his high authority to mislead the Church. It means that, after due consideration, he defines a dogma that has been divinely revealed to the Church by God. And the scope of this power is limited to Faith and Morals—not theology or science or history. So that if the Pope were to declare that the earth was flat or that airplanes were against nature, that would be something quite outside his pontifical authority, and anyone would be free to argue with and dispute his point of view. But when he defines a dogma God has revealed to His Church, then the Pope is infallible, and you cannot argue about the truth of what he has said.

EUSEBIUS AND THE ARIANS

A few weeks ago I read in one of the New York newspaper book review sections that St. Eusebius was condemned by the Church to be burned alive at the stake, for his so-called heretical belief that all men are equal. Is that so?

This is one of the most nonsensical statements ever made in a public print. First of all, Eusebius is said to have been a Saint; then he is declared to have been burned alive at the stake for an heretical opinion. The two statements contradict each other. For it is obvious that he would not have been declared a Saint until after his death; but, so this statement says, he was

burned alive for heresy. In other words, he was both a Saint of the Catholic Church and he was also a heretic. Could anything be more absurd?

Now get the facts. There were actually two Saints named Eusebius, and both were condemned to death as it happened. St. Eusebius, a Roman priest, who died in prison about the year 357, was condemned to imprisonment by the Arians. St. Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli in Italy, who died about the year 370, also was condemned by the Arians. It is one of these two, perhaps both, who is referred to by your book reviewer.

As a matter of historical fact, neither of these two Saints, who are listed as martyrs in the Roman Martyrology, was condemned to death by the Church for maintaining his belief in the equality of man—there never was any question about that. What these two Saints did was to confute most strenuously the heresy of the Arians, who had managed to get the support of the Emperor and the political parties of their time. And the heresy of the Arians, which was fathered by Arius, a priest of Alexandria in Egypt, was that the Incarnate Word was not the equal of the Father, or true God, but merely a most perfect human creature, and thus inferior to God the Father and of a different substance.

Therefore the Church, which is the Foundation and Pillar of the Truth, could not have condemned any Eusebius for maintaining that the Son

was (and is) equal to the Father as touching His Divinity, though less than the Father as touching His humanity (read the Creed of St. Athanasius). The belief that all men are created equal had nothing whatsoever to do with the matter.

LATIN RITES

In the April issue of the CATHOLIC MIND you spoke of the Latin Rite. Would it not be more accurate to speak of the Latin Rites?

Yes. But this distinction should be understood. The different Oriental Rites are each quite distinct, both in language and ritual from one another; whereas the different Latin Rites are more or less variants of the Roman Rite, and they all use Latin as the language of the liturgy.

Among the Latin Rites are the Ambrosian Rite, which is the ancient liturgy of the Church of Milan. This still exists, as does also the Mozarabic Rite, or the Rite of Toledo in Spain, which is observed only in the cathedrals of Toledo and Salamanca. Then there is the Monastic Rite, which is used by the Benedictines and some

other monastic Orders, but is very close to the Roman Rite.

There were other Rites or Uses observed in the pre-Reformation Church which have now passed out of existence. Among these were the Gallican Rite dating back to the 8th century in France; the Celtic Rite which prevailed in Scotland, Ireland, and also in England previous to the coming of St. Augustine. But this Celtic Rite evidently was discontinued after the year 1172. In Great Britain there were numerous Rites or Uses which have passed out of existence, and may be found only in books on the study of the liturgy. Among these were such Uses as that of Sarum, the most notable of all which was compiled by St. Osmund in the 11th century; York, Bangor, Llandaff, Aberdeen.

But in all these Rites and Uses the liturgical language was Latin, and so they may properly be looked upon as variants of the Roman Rite, which is probably the most ancient of the liturgies of the Catholic Church, certainly of the Western Church within the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Rome.



Christ, Priest and Victim

He it is, then, who showed forth in Himself what He knew to be necessary for our true redemption; at once Priest and Victim, at once God and temple: Priest through whom we are reconciled; Victim by which we are reconciled; temple in which we are reconciled; God to whom we are reconciled.—*St. Fulgentius, DE FIDE, AD PETRUM, II, 22.*